

ness, which is the most beneficial and improving fort of *Memory*. And thus, I think, I have gone through all the particulars of your present proposal: both *how to order your Studies to Divinity, what were most conducing to that end, and what first to be taken in hand*, as *briefly* as was possible, conveniently, though, I confess, very much more *largely* than I had originally intended. And I must ingenuously acknowledge that, as I have already professed my self willing; so I am my self suspicious that it will be necessary, that I be corrected in some instances, wherein I cannot pretend to any considerable experience. I believe you may your self easily guess what they are, for I cannot now stay to enumerate them particularly; and as I should be willing my self, so I shall advise you to consult men whom you know to be skilled in each of them severally (if you have any conveniency) before you practise them. But if in any of the rest, wherein I am able, or in any of your particular Studies, you shall meet with any important difficulties, I hope you will use the Ingenuity of a Scholar in freely communicating them to

*Your very affectionate
Friend and Servant,*

H. Dodwell.

DISCOURSE

Concerning

SANCHONIATHON's

Phœnician History.

By HENRY DODWELL, M. A.
*and sometimes Fellow of Trinity Col-
ledge near Dublin in Ireland.*



L O N D O N,

Printed by M. Clark, for B. Tooke at the
Ship in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1681.

T H E
CONTENTS.

THE Occasion of this Discourse, §. I. The Usefulness, §. II. The Credit of Sanchoniathons Work depends either on Porphyry, or Philo Byblius, §. III. The Philosophers allowed a Liberty of Beneficial Falseness; and they who first produced this Author were, in Interest concerned for him, §. IV. Theodoret and Cyril of Alexandria quote him only at the second hand from Eusebius. Several gross mistakes of Cyril, §. V. VI. Sanchoniathon very little known before he was produced by Porphyry, §. VII. VIII. No reason why he might not have been known, even before the time of Philo Byblius, if he had been really genuine, §. IX. He might have been taken notice of, not only as a Historian, but as a Philosopher, §. X. Concerning his Means of Information. The Writings of Taautus. The Antient way of preserving Antiquities by Inscriptions on Sacred Pillars, sometimes abused, and very fit for the designs of Deceivers, §. XI. This was generally pretended to by those who Rivalled each other for Antiquity. The Pro-

2359:09

THE CONTENTS.

phcey of Cham and the Pillars of Seth contained the same Doctrines with those of Mercury, §. XII. XIII. Taautus the same with Mercury. The Ammonian Philosophy the same with the Egyptian, §. XIV. It is improbable that Sanchoniathon could derive his Information from the Books of Mercury, §. XV. Mercury no Phœnician, §. XVI. The Pretences of Philo Byblius for defence of his Author, §. XVII. It is not probable that the Antient Egyptians would have suffered Mercury to have Revealed their Mysteries, §. XVIII. It is not probable that the Egyptian Mercury either would or could have Revealed them, §. XIX. The Son of Thabion perhaps the Second Mercury called Agathodæmon. He is supposed to be the Author of the Modern Greek Writings Fathered on Mercury, (which if meant by Sanchoniathon must be a certain Conviction of his False-hood) perhaps first published by Numenius, §. XX. By Hierom-baal Priest of the God Jevo he meant Gideon. Sanchoniathon could not mistake him for a Priest. Bochart mistaken, §. XXI. It is not Credible that Gideon ever left any Memoirs behind him, §. XXII. Sanchoniathons account of Jewish Affairs could not have been taken from them, §. XXIII.

THE CONTENTS.

§. XXIII. Intrinſick Arguments of juſt Suſpicion againſt this Author. His arrogating to his own Country the glory of all Famous Perſons and Inventions, §. XXIV. Several Inſtances hereof, §. XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII. An Account of the deſign of Philo Byblius in this Impoſture. He was diſaffected to the Jews, and perhaps ſet on this deſign by occaſion of Joſephus's Books againſt Appion, §. XXIX. Joſephus there inſiſted more particularly on the Teſtimonies of Phœnicians. Other things that recommended the Jewish Scriptures to the eſteem of the Learned Heathens of that Age. Several Eminent Jewish Writers who, by Myſtical Expoſitions, brought their own Doctrines near the received Syſteme of the Dogmatical Philoſophers, §. XXX. Heathen Oracles in favour of the Jews owned for genuine by the Heathens themſelves. The good Characters of Abraham and Moſes in the received Orphaicks. Joſeph and Moſes taken for Egyptian Priests, §. XXXI. A Set of Philoſophers, ſeveral of them Antienter than Philo Byblius, who received the Authority of Moſes as a Wiſe Legiſlator and a Prophet, and mentioned him with reſpect. Chalcidius a Heathen, §. XXXII. The Jewish *καταγρηγία* taken

THE CONTENTS.

into the counterfeited Works of Hermes, about the time of Philo Byblius, §. XXXIII. How this might come to pass, §. XXXIV. Philo Byblius's Partiality appears in his making Sanchoniathon prefer his own City Byblos before all the Cities of Phœnicia for Antiquity, even before Berytus it self. Why he makes his Sanchoniathon enquire into the Archives of the particular Cities, §. XXXV. He had, in this Work, a particular design upon the Jews. Why he makes his Sanchoniathon live in the time of Abibalus, §. XXXVI. The time of Sanchoniathon fixed, not by the Age of Semiramis, but of Abibalus. His time, by the Tyrian Records, either Equal, or a little before the War of Troy, §. XXXVII. Why he was to Father his Informations, concerning Jewish Matters, on a Jew and a Priest, §. XXXVIII. Why on a Priest of the God Jevo, and on Gideon particularly. How he might from his Name collect his being a Priest. Hierombaal, ירמבאל and ירמל, §. XXXIX. Why he was to begin with a Κοσμογονία. All Books concerning Egyptian Notions Fathered on Hermes. The Fashion of Fathering all latter Inventions of a Sect on the First Author of it, especially in their Dialogues, §. XL. The Egyptian Philosophy followed by Sanchoniathon.

THE CONTENTS.

niathon. How he secured himself from suspicion of mistake in Interpreting Mercury. How the Greeks came to be mistaken, §. XLI. How the Egyptians. Φαριμας. Ἀπόρυφα γεγυμνα, §. XLII. How Philo Byblius secures his Sanchoniathon from the suspicion of Fabling, and what Fables he means, §. XLIII. XLIV. Yet he forgot himself and Fathered a Scandalous Fable upon him, §. XLV. The Name of Sanchoniathon perhaps borrowed from the Famous Egyptian Sonchis. The Atlantick Theology probably the same with that of Mercury, §. XLVI. Recapitulation, §. XLVII. The Scripture needs no Confirmation from Heathen Authors, §. XLVIII.

A
DISCOURSE,

Concerning

SANCHONIATHON's
Phœnician History.*In Enseb. Præp. Evang. l. 1. ch. 10.*

§. I. **H**AVING in the latter of these Letters intimated some suspicion concerning the genuineness of *Sanchoniathon*, and considering how generally Learned men receive and quote him for an Author of that Antiquity he pretends to; as it will become me to purge my self from the suspicion of *Heterodoxy*, so I believe it will not be ingrateful to the ingenious inquisitive Reader to understand what may be said concerning him. Which I shall do from some Letters which passed between me and a Learned Friend concerning him before the Publication of these *Letters of Advice*, and which were, in truth, the Reasons of my passing that censure upon him.

§. II. THE *Credit* of this Author does the rather deserve an accurate and impartial

N. IX.

tial Examination, because of the great use which is made of him in clearing several *Historical* and *Philosophical* passages of the *Old Testament*; and because he is generally taken for the *Faithfullest*, and *Antientest*, and consequently the most *useful* *Heathen Author* that was extant within the Memory of Learned Ages. Which might make all who either have formerly, or do still believe him so, think nothing too difficult to be confirmed by his Credit.

(*) So Theodoret. *Therap.* II. Σαγ-
χωνιάδων, ὁ καὶ τῶν Φοινίκων δι-
λεκτον φιλαλήδης, &c. And so
his Translator. But I had rather
correct him from Eusebius whom
he Transcribes; who, in two
places where he has occasion to
cite this same passage, agrees
with himself, and yet differs from
Theodoret. So therefore he: Σαγ-
χωνιάδων, ὁ καὶ τῶν Φοινίκων φι-
λαλήδης, &c. Συναγὰγων καὶ
συγγραφέας. Reading φιλαλήδης
for φιλαλήδης; and opposing
Sanchoniathon's writing in the
Phœnician to the Greek Transla-
tion of him by Philo Byblius, and
referring φιλαλήδης to what fol-
lows συναγὰγων καὶ συγγραφέας,
not to Sanchoniathon mentioned
before, *Pr. Ev. l. 10. X. 9.* And
then there will appear no footsteps of any *Etymology* of his Name.
Yet Bochart gives a likely *Etymology* for that purpose, which, if it
hold, will shew, at least, a design of *Philo Byblius* in giving him that
particular Name. * *Exf. Pr. Ev. l. 10. 31. A. X. 9. 48.* Theodoret
Therap. II.

(*) His very Name was
observed to signifie *φι-
λαλήδης*, which if it were
given him by his *Con-
temporaries*, must needs
have been a great atte-
station of his *Integrity*
from them who had best
reason to know him.* As
for his Age, he is pre-
tended equal to *Abiba-
lus*, to whom he is said
to have Dedicated this
his *Phœnician History*,
that *Abibalus*, I mean
who,

who, by the *Phœnician Records*, is sup-
posed to be the Father of *Hieromenus* or
Eiromus, conceived to be the same with
Hiram, contemporary with *David* and
Solomon as appears, not only from the
Scriptures, but also from the same *Phœni-
cian Records*, on whose credit, no doubt,
it is that *Josephus* makes the Eleventh

year complete, or Twelfth begun of *XI^o Hiram*, Ant.
Hiram, to concur with the Fourth *VIII. 2. p. 259^o*
of *Solomon*, wherein the Temple *Ed. Gen. XII^o c.*
was built. For he had the sum of *App. l. 1. p. 1043.*
those Records Collected to his hand by
Menander Ephesus and *Dius* and
Hieronymus Tyrius, and others,
without whose assistance he could
not have been so particular in fix-
ing the certain year of *Hiram*.

Vid. *Joseph. Ant.*
VIII. 2. Cont. Ap-
pion. l. 1. Theoph.
Antidob. l. 1. ad
Autolyc.

[The Learned *Bochart* would have this
Abibalus King of *Berytus* distinct from
him who was King of *Tyre*, and *Antienter*.
But if the account hold which we shall
afterwards give from the *Phœnician Re-
cords*, to shew him to have been Equal or
a little *Antienter* than the War of *Troy*,
(exactly as this *Abibalus* the Father of *Hi-
ram* is placed by them who mention him)
it will then appear that no other was meant
than the Father of *Hiram*. That he is
called King of the *Berytians*, was for no
other

other end but to signifie that he was *San-
choniathon's* Prince who was of *Berytus*,
exactly as *Sanchoniathon* himself is in *Athe-
neus* and *Suidas* made a *Tyrian*, because his
Berytus was, in his time, under the Jurisdi-
ction of *Tyre*, which is again another proba-
bility that his *Abibalus* was the same with
the K. of *Tyre*.] *Porphyry* himself who first
produced this *Sanchoniathon* against the
Christians, makes him equal to *Semiramis*,
who as he tells us in *Eusebius's Preparation*,
was either before or equal to the Wars of
Troy; but he is confuted by *Eusebius* who
makes her Eight hundred and fifty years
earlier than that same War. Her Hus-
band *Ninus* is generally, by *Heathen Au-
thors*, made the utmost Period of all Hi-
stories they were acquainted with, who
yet mention many things Antienter than
that War of *Troy*. [But this matter is ex-
cellently accounted for by the Learned
and Judicious Sir *John Marsham*, who
shews that *Porphyry* herein followed the
more likely account of *Herodotus*, though
Ctesias's larger account had the luck to
be more received. *Deioces* (the First
King of the *Medes* after their revolt from
the *Assyrians* according to *Herodotus*,)
began his Reign *Olymp. 17. 4.* according
to *Eusebius*. The whole time of the *Assy-*

Pr. Eu. l. 9.
p. 31. B.
Chron. L. 11
in it.

Tertul. de
Pal. c. 2. ubi
Salmas. & a
Gerda. Euf.
Pr. Ev. x.
9. p. 485.
486. Ma-
crob. in
somn. Scip.
11. 19.
Oros. L. 1.
Chron.
Con. A-
gypt. Sec.
xvii. p.
522. Edit.
Lips.

Euf. Chron.
Herodot. L.
1. c.

rians

rians was Five hundred and Twenty years
according to *Herodotus*. If therefore we
reckon backward from that Fourth year
of the Seventeenth *Olympiad*, the time of
Semiramis who succeeded her Husband
Ninus, will fall out much about the time
where *Porphyry* places it. Nor was *Por-
phyry* alone, though he had indeed few
Companions, in following *Herodotus*.
He shews that *Appian* did so too, and the
most Judicious *Dionysius Halicarnassensis*,
and *Josephus*. And, which is more par-
ticularly observable to our present pur-
pose, *Philo Byblius* also agrees with him
in placing *Semiramis* later than usually,
whom he makes Two thousand years later
than the Building of *Babylon*.] Besides
the Authenticalness of the Records, from
whence he derived his Information, is ex-
tremely considerable, (if it should prove
really what it is pretended) the Sacred
Writings of *Taautus*, that is *Mercury*,
(of whom there is so much mention in
those yet earlier Times, of which he wrote
his History) the *Ἀποκρυφαὶ Ἀμυσίων γεγραμμένα*.
Euf. Pr. Ev. l. 9. 32. B. the *ἱερομνήματα* of
Hierombaal Priest of the God *Jevozb*. p. 31.
the *ἱερομνήματα* of their Cities, and the
Ἀναγραφαὶ of their Temples, &c. But as so
great Recommendations of Fidelity, of
Antiquity,

Appian,
Præf. Dion.
Halitarn.
L. 1. Philo
ap. Steph.
Basil.

Philo By-
blius ap.
Euf. Pr. Ev.
l. 9. 31. D.

Antiquity, and sufficient means of *Information*, must needs make him very useful for the *Discovery* of many and momentous *Truths*, if justly challenged; so, on the contrary, must they make his Authority very mischievous for seducing those, who trust it, into numerous and dangerous *Errors*, if they should after all be found *False* and *Groundless*. Let us see therefore, whether these challenges be as *just* as they are specious and *plausible*.

§. III. AND here I consider First, that all these Arguments of his Credibility depend, as to Us, either on the pure Testimony of *Porphyry*, who was the first who produced him with any great applause and confidence, and who is therefore justly suspicious, if not of wholly coining him, yet at least of a partial favour to him, and of the first endeavours to justify and defend him after the neglects that had been cast upon him since the time that he had first been Published and Translated by *Philo Byblius*, or else of *Philo Byblius* himself. *Athenæus* is the only Author extant that quoted him, that we know of, from the time of *Philo Byblius* to *Porphyry*, supposing that the *Συγγραμματα*, whose *Phœnician* Antiquities are quoted by him, and joyned with *Mochus* another very Antient *Phœnician*

Athen. Deipnosoph. L. 3.

Phœnician Writer often taken notice of, were the same with our *Sanchoniathon*, as he is commonly conceived to be, and I believe, not improbably, though he in *Athenæus* was a *Tyrian*, ours a *Berytian*, a difference not very difficultly reconcilable, as has been shewn. If it should prove otherwise, then *Porphyry* alone must answer for both, not only the pretended *Sanchoniathon* himself, but the pretended Greek Translation also of him by *Philo Byblius*. But to allow him all the favour that is reasonable, and to grant that this *Philo Byblius* is to be suspected of the Original fraud, because of this more Antient citation of him by *Athenæus*, which could have been from none but *Philo Byblius*; yet *Porphyry* must needs be looked on as the retriever of a neglected, and therefore suspicious Author, who must have been by that time very Famous, if he had been thought genuine, which is very considerable for my present purpose.

§. IV. FOR I consider further, that as the Principles both of the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonists* (who were both of them admired by *Porphyry*) allowed the Lawfulness of *Medicinal* falsehoods, as they called them, which was no doubt the Original

For the *Pythagoreans*, see *Tim. Loc. πρὸς ἁποκρίσεις*. For the *Platonists*, *Plato* himself *de Rep. L. 3. v. S. Hieronym. adv. Ruf. L. 1.*

first

first of those *Mythological* Stories with which they first beautified their *Dialogues*, then of all those *Forgeries* which were afterwards introduced by the *Monks*, who from their first Institution were of a *Philosophical* Extraction and Genius; I say besides these *Principles* which may let us see that it was possible he might deal disingenuously with us; the occasion of his first producing him, and his design, were such as may make him further suspicious of using the utmost liberty of his *Principles* actually. For it was purposely to

See the words of
Porphyry in Euf. Pr.
Ev. l. 9. X. 9. Theo-
doret Therap. II.

confront the *Antiquity* of the *Scriptures*, and in that very work which was designed to overthrow the *Credit of Christianity*. The like I

* §. 36. shall (*) hereafter observe concerning *Philo Byblius*.

§. V. But that I may not therefore conclude him guilty of a disingenuous *Fact*, only because it was agreeable, not only to *Principles*, but his *Design*, and *Interest*; Let us consider the thing it self, and see whether it be likely that either *Sanhoniathon*, or his Translator *Philo Byblius*, were ever had in any esteem till *Porphyry* vouched for them. If they were, how comes it to pass that none but *Athenaus* should take notice of an Author so extremely

treemly valuable, if he had been genuine? How comes it to pass, that those few *Christians* that mention him afterwards should quote him only at the *Second hand* from *Eusebius*, or at the uttermost from *Porphyry*? Why had they not rather recourse to *Philo Byblius* himself, if he had been common? And what imaginable reason is there why he should not have been *Common*, especially in those Eastern parts so near *Phœnicia*, if he had been valued, or thought genuine? Yet (a) *Theodoret* it seems had never seen him, but only in *Eusebius*. (b) *St. Cyril of Alexandria* was so far from quoting what he had occasion to produce out of him from the Original of *Philo Byblius*, as that his memory, on which he seems to have quoted him from *Eusebius*, betrayed him into several and great mistakes. He first pretends to have had what he says concerning him from *Clemens Alexandrinus's Stromatēs*. A plain sign he had not seen *Philo Byblius* himself. Yet who can doubt but that he also mistook *Clemens Alexandrinus* for *Eusebius*? It is certain there is no mention of *Sanhoniathon* or his Translator in the *Stromatēs* of *Clemens* as we have them extant at present. Was it therefore in what is lost? There are but two Imper-

(a) Therap.
II. III.
from Euf.
Pr. Ev. X. 9.
(b) Cont.
Julian. l. vi

Strom. VI.
p. 617. A.

Cod. CXI.

fections in the whole Work, the beginning of the *First* Book, and the *Eighth*. What was wanting in the beginning of the *First* Book, we know by what remains to have been nothing but Introduction, where he had yet no occasion of meddling with the *Antiquity* of Phœnician Writers. Not in the *Eighth* Book, where by what he promises in the *Sixth*, we know he designed to answer the Heathens concerning the *Coming of our Lord*, that is, I suppose, concerning his *coming so lately*, and in *so mean appearance* (which were the Popular Objections of that Age) or else concerning his *Second coming* to Judge *Persecutors* and *Unbelievers*, which ordinarily concluded their *Controversial Writings*. So the Sacred Writers of the *New Testament* frequently. So St. Cyprians Second Book of *Testimonies*, *ad Quirin*. which seems to have been the *last* of that Work. So *Irenæus* in the last Chapters *adv. Her.* So *Lactantius Lib. VII. Div. Inst. Phil. Commodianus* is more particularly large on this Argument. But neither of these could afford him any occasion of mentioning this Author. For none can doubt but what now, and in *Photius's* time, possessed the place of the *Eighth* Book had no affinity with the Argument of

of this Work. And yet neither is there any mention of *Sanchoniathon* or his *Translator*. But to put the matter out of doubt that this was only a mistake of St. Cyril, as I said; where *Clemens* had indeed occasion to dispute the Question of *Stromat. 1. Antiquity* between the *Heathens* and the *Sacred Writers*, there he has not the least intimation of either of them; and the very words quoted by St. Cyril are exactly in *Eusebius*, but not as out of the Text of *Sanchoniathon*, but the *Preface* of *Philo Byblius*. Which he could not so easily have confounded if he had used the Book it self; but might very probably in borrowing them from *Eusebius*, who comprises all he or *Porphyrus* had collected both out of the *Text* and the *Preface*, in the same Chapters immediately following each other. Besides *Porphyrus* reckons but Eight Books of *Sanchoniathon de Abst. 11. n. 56.* but *Eusebius* Nine, reckoning it seems the very *Preface* of *Philo* for a distinct Book. Which being quoted for *Sanchoniathon's* by Cyril, shews that he follows the very division of *Eusebius*, and therefore took what he had from him.

Bochart conceives the *Physiology* or *Theogony* to have been a distinct Book from the History. But see what is said hereafter.

§. VI. BUT what is it he pretends to tell us from *Clemens Alexandrinus*? That

Sanctoniathon's Book was Translated by *Josephus*. But who ever mentions such a Translation amongst the Works of *Josephus*? How is it credible that he should so far favour the cause of the *Phœnicians* who so professedly maintains the greater *Antiquity* of the *Scriptures* against them in his Books against *Appion*? And who can reconcile this pretended Testimony from *Clemens* with *Porphyry*, who certainly, if any, conversed with the Original Translation? If he be to be credited, here are again two great mistakes of *St. Cyril*, First his mistaking *Philo Byblius* for the famous *Alexandrian Philo* the Jew; then his confounding that *Philo* with *Josephus* who was of the same Nation. Which again plainly shew, that he quoted him by memory, and at the *Second hand*.

§. VII. BUT besides that this *silence*, or *Second-hand* Quotations, even after the time he was divulged and applauded by *Porphyry*, are strong suspicions that he was either not known; or not regarded, (either of which are equally serviceable to my purpose;) yet further, what should be the reason that so useful and Antient an Author should be so little known even before the time of *Porphyry*? Was it because he was locked up in the *Phœnician* Tongue

Tongue? But why should he not at least, have been better known after the *Greek* Translation of him by *Philo Byblius*? Yet even then so little was he known that, were it not for the forementioned Testimony of *Athenæus*, we might justly doubt whether such a Translation was ever undertaken by that *Philo*. *Suidas* mentions this *Philo*, and reckons up others of his Works, and fixes his time. He places him near the Reign of *Nero*, and makes him Threescore and Eighteen years old, at the Consulship of *Severus Herennius* in *Olymp.* 220. Which if it be true must fall at least about the Reign of *Trajan*, though no such Consulship appear in our present *Fasti*, possibly because he might have been either a *Suffectus*, or expunged out of the publick *Fasti* for some Crime. Nay, he expressly makes him to have Written concerning the Reign of *Hadrian*. And therefore, in all likelihood the broken number of the odd *Olympiads* above Two hundred and twenty is wanting in *Suidas*. But what ground *Scaliger* had to fix the year of the 229. *Olymp.* I do not understand. Yet no such Translation appears in that Catalogue of his Works, unless it were contained under the *ἄλλα*.

ῥοσὶ φίλων

*Scaliger, in
ὀλυμπιάδ.
συναγωγῇ*

§.VIII. AND why should he never have been mentioned by those antient *Apolo- gists* for the *Christian* Religion who wrote before *Porphyry*? They had a just occasion for it in that great Dispute concerning the *Antiquity* of the *Scriptures* above all *Hea- then* Authors. On this occasion they drew up Catalogues of the Antientest *Heathen* Authors they knew of, yet *Sanchoniathon*, the most apposite Instance of them all, never being so much as thought of. Not by *Justin Martyr* in the time of *Antoninus Pius*, though he was a *Samari- tan*, and had thereby the opportunity to have known the Famous Writers of his Neighbouring *Phœnicians*, nay to have understood them though they had not been Translated to his hand. Yet he knew of nothing *Antient* either amongst the *Greeks* or the *Barbarians*. Which how could he have said if he had known any thing of this most Antient *Sanchoniathon*? Not by *Theophilus Antiochenus* in the time of *Verus*, with whom he ends his *Chrono- logy*, though he were nearer the *Phœni- cians* than the *Grecians*, nay and had special occasion in mentioning the *Phœ- nician* Antiquities. Not by *Tatianus* the Scholar of St. *Justin*, and so not long, if at all, after him, when he wrote his *Ora-*

*Οὐδ' ἔτι
τί οὐ γὰρ
μακρὰ
ἐν, Ἑλλή-
ων ἢ Βαρ-
βάρων ἐν-
μαίον
πρᾶξιν.
Just. Mart.
Paræn.
p. 13.

Ad Auto-
lyc. L. III.

tion against the *Greeks* (it does not ap-
pear that St. *Justin* was then dead, though
I know how *Tatianus* is mistaken
by *Eusebius*, who has also generally
deceived the Learned who have
followed him) though he was an
Assyrian, and takes particular no-
tice of the Antientest *Græcian* and
Phœnician Authors, and names all
the most Antient *Phœnicians* that
he knew of, which were but Three,
Theodotus, *Mochus*, and *Hypsicra-
tes*. Not by *Clemens* as has already
been observed, who deduces his
computation to the death of *Com-
modus*, though he also had occasi-
on, in disputing that same Con-
troversie concerning the Age of the most
Antient *Heathen* Writers. I think
St. *Cyril's* mistake concerning him, has
been sufficiently discovered and convict-
ed. Not by *Tertullian* in the times of
Severus and *Caracalla*, though he had also
the like occasion given him in his *Apology*.
Not by *Origen*, though he refers to *Josè-
phus* against *Appion*, and *Tatianus* for a
Collection of such *Phœnician* Authors as
had mentioned any thing concerning
Jewish Affaires; nay mentions *Herennius
Philo* who had written concerning the

Euseb. Eccl. Hist. IV.
16. He only sayes
that *Crescens* had
endeavoured the
death of St. *Justin*
(αγαπητὸν λέγει
his Word) but he
has not the least
intimation that it
was in his power
to accomplish it.
What he sayes was
only taken from
Justin's own words
in his *Apology*.
Or. adv. Græc. p. 171
& ap. *Euseb. Pr. Ev.*
X. 2. p. 493.
Strom. I.

Apolog.
C. 19.

C. cels. lib.
I. p. 13. 14.

Jews, if this be the *Philo* to whom the Translation of *Sanchoniathon* is ascribed by *Porphry*, as in all likelihood he is the *Philo* mentioned by *Suidas*, who had said of himself that his Sur-name was *Herennius*. And the Title of *Herennius Philo* is given him in the Inscription of a M. S. Work of his on *Aristotles Metaphysicks*, now in the Library of the most accomplished and truly Great Dr. *Isaac Vossius*. And my very Dear and very Learned Friend Dr. *Lloyd* conceives that he might have borrowed that Sur-name of *Herennius* from his Patron *Herennius Severus* the Consul, which was usually for *Liberti* to

* do in those times; and that the Consul was the same with him mentioned in *Pliny*, *Ep. Lib. iv. 28.* who there appears to have been a Lover of Learning, and himself a very Learned Person. The Times do very well agree; and it is not otherwise easie to conceive how *Philo* a *Phœnician* should

come by a *Roman* Name. And that he was very intimate with that Consul appears both by his dating his own Age by his

*When they were made *Liberti* they were not only made *Romans*, but taken into the Families of their Patrons, as appears from the Inscriptions of their Family Sepulchres, which were generally conceived in that Form, *FILIIS ET FILIABUS, LIBERTIS ET LIBERTABUS POSTERISQUE EORUM.* And then how proper was it for them to receive the *Gentile* name of their Patrons Family?

his Patrons Consulship and by his bringing *Hermippus* his Country-man and Scholar acquainted with him. Yet even on this occasion, *Origen* makes no mention of his *Sanchoniathon* among those *Phœnician* Writers which he immediately refers to as mentioning *Jewish* affairs. How could he have slipt such an opportunity as this was, of mentioning him, if he had known him? Not even by *Celsus* himself, whom *Origen* places under *Hadrian*, though he must certainly have lived later if he be the same to whom *Lucian* dedicated his *Pseudomantis* after the death of *Marcus Antoninus* whom he calls *Θεός*, nay must have Written this very Work against the *Christians* later than *Hadrian*, for (1) *Marcellina* and (2) *Marcion*, both of them mentioned by him, as they first broached their *Heresies* under *Anicetus*, so most probably after the death of *Hadrian*. *Philo* was as his work mentioned by *Origen* shews him, sufficiently disaffected to the *Jews*, so that if he did Translate any such work of *Sanchoniathon*, he would most probably have designed it as *Porphry*, to confront the Antiquity of the *Jews*. And how greedily would *Celsus* have seconded him if he had known of any such work Published by him? Thus it appears that this

See *Suid. in*
"Ερμippου."

(1) *ap. Orig*
L. v. p. 272.
(2) *ap. Orig*
L. vi. p.
326. & ubi
suprà.

this *Sanhoniathon* was either generally not known, or (which amounts to the same thing) generally neglected by all sorts of Authors, both *Christians* and *Heathens* too, from the time of *Philo Byblius* to *Porphyry*.

§. IX. BUT to ascend yet higher, what should hinder him from being known even before *Philo Byblius*, if he had been what he is pretended? It is true, he could neither have been known nor deservedly valued by the *Greeks* till he was Translated. But what imaginable cause is there why he was not Translated more Antiently? The *Phœnician Records*, and *Histories* had been searched and Translated and divulged by *Hieronymus Tyrius*, *Menander Ephesius* and *Dius, Hestæus* and *Philostratus* and others; nay the very Original Records themselves are quoted by *Josephus*, and the Original Copies of the Epistles between *Solomon* and *Hiram* are still mentioned as extant in their *Archives* by the same *Josephus* and *Theophilus Antiochenus*. How comes it to pass they should all of them overlook this most considerable, most creditable Author? Why should they omit this most Antient account of their most Antient times, when the great design of all these Enquiries seems to have been

Vid. Bochart. Chanaan L. II. c. 17. Joseph. Ant. VIII. 2. c. Appion. L. I.

Theoph. Ant. L. III. ad Autolye.

been a General Dispute concerning the most Antient Nations? Why did they not Translate him then? Why did they not, at least, take out of him, and vouch him for their Authority? Had they done so, why should not *Josephus* have had recourse to him, if not in his *Phœnician* Original, yet at least as to those particulars they had borrowed from him? Why does he never mention him either in his *Antiquities*, or his Books against *Appion*, especially in those things which he relates concerning *Abraham*, which he was particularly careful to confirm by the best Testimonies he knew of? Ant. I. 8.

§. X. *Sanhoniathon* had been useful even to those who had enquired only for their *Histories*. But consider we him further as a *Philosopher*; for such the Writers of the *Θεογονίαι* and especially of the *Κοσμογονίαι* whereof much of *Sanhoniathon's* Work consisted, were then reputed, that being the usual *Mystical* way whereby they concealed the secrets of their *Natural Philosophy*. So also *Suidas* Σαγχωνιάθων. ΤύειΘ ΦιλόσοφΘ. Indeed the *Θεολογία* seems to have been the same with the *Κοσμογονία*. For what *Eusebius* had called the *Θεολογία* of the *Phœnicians* Pr. Ev. l. 9. that he calls their *Κοσμογονία* c. 10. To which he adds the *Ζωογονία*

Ζωροάστρης also for compleating it. For both these were pretended to be taken from the *Κοσμογραφία* of *Taautus*. Yet even so, there were several fair occasions of discovering, and Translating him, Antienter than *Philo*. For their Antientest *Philosophers* had been also enquired into long before *Philo*. What was *Pythagoras*'s design in Travelling amongst them? Was it only to see their Countries and their Fashions? Was it not rather to acquaint himself with their *Philosophical* Improvements? And would he, who is so much celebrated for his Conversation with the *Phœnician* Prophets, the Posterity of *Mochus*, not rather have employed his time in inquiring after this equally, if not more, Antient both *Historian* and *Philosopher* *Sanchoiathon*? After the *Macedonian* Conquests had opened an access for the *Greek Philosophers* to the *Phœnician Archives*; they then Translated as many as were valued by them. *Theodotus* and *Hypsicrates* and *Mochus*

Orat. adv. Græc. Chætus. But *Astus* in a fragment of the Oration, as quoted by *Euseb. Pr. Ev. X. 11*. But *Barchart* corrects it *Letus*, and rightly *Geogr. Lib. XVI*.

were Translated by *Astus* or *Chætus* as *Tatianus* tells us; and the same concerning *Mochus* and many others appears from *Strabo*. How comes *Sanchoiathon*, if there had then been any such Author extant, to have escaped their diligence?

§. XI. He

§. XI. HE pretends to have had his Information from the Writings of *Taautus*, from the *Mystical* Books of the *Ammonians*, and the *ὑπομνήματα* or *Memoires* of *Jerombaal* the Priest of the God *Jevo*, the *ὑπομνήματα* of the particular Cities and the *Ἀναγραφαὶ* of their Temples. Things very considerable indeed, if they had been truly pretended to. But let us see whether there be any reason to believe them on his credit. It was indeed a very Antient way of preserving knowledg to inscribe what they would preserve in Pillars to be kept in the Temples of their most Eminent Gods, the better to be secured from Weather and the Violence of Profane hands. Thus they did with their Laws, with their Leagues and Covenants, with their Histories, and their Arts and Sciences. Instances might have been given of all these sorts, if I had thought it necessary. Particularly, for Histories there was that of *Enemerus* from the Inscriptions in the Temple of *Jupiter Triphylus*; for Arts, those from whence *Callisthenes* gave *Aristotle* an account of the Eclipses observed by the Chaldeans, those of the same *Babylonians* referred to by *Epigenes*, *Be-rosus* and *Critodemus*, and the Fam-

Vid. *Plutarch de Isid. & Osirid. La-stant. Div. Inst. L. 11. Ap. Simpl. in Arist. de Cælo. L. 11. Com. 16. Plin. Nat. Hist. VII. 56.*

ous

Plutarch.
de Isid. &
Osirid.
P. 360.

ous *Pillars* of *Seth* mentioned by *Josephus*. Out of such *Pillars* as these no doubt the Publisher of *Sanchoniathon* would have us believe his History to have been gathered. Nor was it unusual for *Deceivers* to impose on the World on the credit of such *Pillars*. *Enemerus* now mentioned was looked on by Antiquity as a Famous instance of it. For it was certainly the easiest way for broaching False-hoods. These were *Monuments* which could be produced on the sudden concerning the most remote Antiquities without the attestation of Antient *Writings*, because themselves were supposed to be *Originals* of the times they pretended to give account of; were supposed remote from *Vulgar Knowledge* or *understanding*, being either kept in the *Adyta*, or locked up in some obsolete unknown *Character*, which none but the *Learned* and the *Priests* could understand; were contrived in *Hieroglyphicks* or such *ambiguous* notes as were capable of what *Interpretation* those designing Persons who produced them were pleased to put upon them; depended generally on *Oral Tradition*, than which there is not a more unfaithful *Conveyer* of *Monuments* to *Posterity*; depended wholly on the credit of the

the *Priests*, being withall generally interested in the things thus preserved, making for the *credit* of their false *Religion*, or the *credit* of their *Nation*, for *Antiquity*, or rare *Inventions*; were to be found and examined only in *one place* (not like *Books* every where) nor even there it self without the Leave and Directions of such interested *Priests*. Upon this account their very *humoured* Stories with which it was fashionable in those times to adorn their *Dialogues*, were grounded on the credit of such pretended *Inscriptions*. So *Cebes's Table*, and the *Samothracian Inscriptions* referred to by *Axiochus*, and those concerning the *Atlantides* in *Timæus*.

§. XII. AND thus it was generally in the disingenuous dealings of those Nations, which upon the appearing of the *Jewish Scriptures* in the common Tongue, began to rival them, and one another for *Antiquity*. Thus the *Babylonians* in *Democritus* preserved their *Moral Discourses* in the *Pillars* of *Acicarus*. Thus *Xisuthrus* in *Berosus* is said to have preserved the *Chaldean Inventions* Ingraven in *Plates* from the Deluge. Thus *Manetho* pretended to have gathered his new *Dynasties* from the like *Pillars* of *Mercury*. So *Cham* is pretended to have preserved his

Clem. Alex.
Strom. i.
P. 303.

Euseb. Gr.
P. 6.

Cassian.
Coll. viii. 21

*Clem. Alex-
andrin.
Strom. VI.
p. 642. A.*

*Plutarch.
de Isid. &
Osirid.*

*(1.) Horus
Apoll. c. 3.
Plutarch.
de Isid. &
Osirid. Chalci-
dus, in Pla.
Timeum
malè sole-
28. Porphy.
de antr.
Nymphar.
(2.) Clem.
Alexand.
Strom. I.
p. 335. C.*

his inventions in *Judicial Astrology* by the like invention of Ingravating them in Plates, which Plates they usually fastned to *Pillars*; from whence I am apt to think that the *Gnosticks* might take occasion to forge that *Prophecy* which was among them obtruded in those times under his Name. And as *Ægyptian* Notions were the Principal ingredient in most of those Antient *Heresies* that were comprehended under the common Name of *Gnosticks*; so I am apt to think that *Chemi* the Antient Name of *Ægypt* gave them occasion to father what they pleased on a Scripture-Patriarch of a Name that had some affinity to it, besides that the *Scripture* it self calls *Ægypt* so often the Land of *Ham*, so that the Inscriptions of *Cham* and *Mercury* were probably the very same. The like I also conceive concerning the *Pillars* of *Seth* aforementioned from *Josephus*. Nor is the mistake so difficult as may be imagined. It is very well known that the *Dog-star* was by the *Ægyptians* called (1) *Sothis*; That the revolution of their great year was accordingly from it called *Sothiaca* (2) *Periodus*, because the *Dog-star* then returned exactly to the very same place where he had been before; That their great year was therefore called

κωνικὸς

κωνικὸς or *Canicularis*, as *Censorinus* tells us, because it began exactly on the first day of that Month on which the *Dog-star* rose, which was the *Ægyptian Thoth*. Who sees not that the whole contrivance of that year was exactly fitted to the course of that *Star*? And that therefore *Thoth* was reckoned for the first Month in the year because the *Dog-star* rose in it? If therefore its Name were given it with any design, it seems to have been therefore called *Thoth* because their *Sothis* rose in it, and therefore that those two Names are indeed designed for the same. Nor is the change of *S* and *Th* either difficult or unusual in those Tongues, as might have been shewn by multitudes of Examples if I had leisure.

§. XIII. But whether the Name of *Thoth* and *Sothis* were Originally the same or not; yet it seems clear that the Notions of *Mercury* were inscribed to *Sothis*. So *Manetho's Sacred History* (in the same Sense no doubt, that *Ennius's* Translation of *Euemerus's* History, pretended also from *Sacred Pillars* was also called *Sacred*) is called the *Βίβλος Σόθειας* in *Euseb. ib.* And, which yet comes more fully home to what I am now proving, the very Name *σὺς* is used in this matter

C

from

*De dienat.
c. 18.*

*Lactant.
Div. Inst.
L. I. c. 11.*

from *Petofiris* an *Ægyptian* Writer, by
 In loc *Euf. Vettius Valens*, *Antiochenus* in *Scaliger* and
 Chr. Græc. others, and that in the *Masculine Gender*.
 p. 6. But this whole matter will be yet plainer
 if we remember that the design of *Manetho*
 (1) was to fit his *Chronology* to that *Sothiac*
 (1) *Period*. We see it accordingly prevailed
 in most of the later *Ægyptian Chronologies*,
 which pretended to any more than ordi-
 nary *Exactness*. So the *Destruction* of
Troy is noted in *Clem.* (2) *Alexandrinus*,
 most probably from an *Ægyptian* Author.
 (3) So were the years of *Nabonassar* in *Ptolomies*
 (2) *Strom. I. Canon*, and the *Babylonian Eclipses* fitted
 (3) *Ptol.* to the same *Canicular year* by (3) *Hippar-*
 L. iv. c. ult. *chus*. Now this *Sothiac Period* was pur-
 p. 104. posely invented to give a full and exact
 account of the *Suns* course, till he was to
 rise exactly in the same place of the *Zo-*
diac where he had risen before. For pro-
 ceeding on this *Hypothesis* that the true
Solar year consisted of 365 days and 1/4, this
 Fourth was not intercalated every Fourth
 year, as in the *Julian* account, but per-
 mitted to run on (purposely that their
 Festivities might pass through the whole
 year,) till those Fourth parts of a *Day*
 made up a whole *Year*, which they did in
 1461. *Ægyptian*, equivalent to 1460.
Julian years. That this was purposely
 designed

designed to signify the Course of the
Sun, appears from their calling the whole
 Period by the Name of (*) *Annus* Ἡλιακός, (*) *cenfor.*
 and ὁ Θεὸς ἐνιαυτὸς, as the Name of Θεὸς sim- de d. nat. c.
 18.
 ply taken, signifies the *Sun* in *Antient*
Authors. But the *Sun*, whose Course
 this was, was called *Typhon*, as *Typhon* was
 also called *Seth*, as *Plutarch*
 (*) assures us. Accordingly
 as most of the *Ægyptian*
 Names of *Persons* and *Pla-*
ces were taken from their
Gods, so we have still foot-
 steps of this *Gods* name in
 the Names of *Sethron*, *Se-*
thos, *Sethosis*, &c. And then
 it cannot be thought
 strange, that as his whole
Book is denominated from
 his *Chronological Period*, so
 that *Period* it self should
 be ascribed to the *Ægyptian*
Seth, and consequently the
Pillars also from which these accounts
 were taken. It may be another account
 may be given of this matter, that by the
Pillars of *Seth* may be meant only their
 belonging to *Egypt*. So it appears that
 the same King who was called *Egyptus* by
 the *Greeks*, was by the *Ægyptians* them-
 selves

(*) Οἱ δὲ τοῖςδε τοῖς φυσικοῖς
 καὶ τῷ ἀπ' Ἀστρολογίας Μαθη-
 ματικῶν ἐνιαυτοῖς Τυ-
 φῶνα μὲν οἶον ὃ Ἡλια-
 κὸν κόσμον. *Plutarch. de Isid.*
 & *Osirid. p. 367. C.* And a little
 after: Διὸ τὸ Τυφῶνα Σηθ εἰς
 Αἰγύπτῳ καλεῖται, ὅτι οὗτος
 καταδυναστεύον ἢ καταβια-
 ζόμενον. Where we have the
 signification of *Seth* in the
Ægyptian Tongue, and the rea-
 son why the *Sun* and *Typhon*
 were called so. Again, τὸ Σηθ
 αὐτὸν Τυφῶνα καλεῖται, ὅτι
 οὗτος τὸ καταδυναστεύον καὶ κα-
 ταβιαζόμενον. p. 371. B. Again
 ὁ δὲ Τυφῶν (ὡς αὖ εἴρη) Σηθ. p. 376. A.

selves called *Sethos*, and as it seems from thence concluded by *Manetho* to have been the same with him whom the *Greeks* called *Ægyptus* the Brother of *Danaus*, (who neither was himself known to the *Egyptians*, by the name of *Danaus* but *Armais*) because *Sethos* in the *Egyptian* Tongue, signified the same thing as *Ægyptus* in the *Greek*. Now the Name of *Egypt* was derived from the Name of *Ægyptus*, by which he was known to the *Greeks*, and therefore proportionably the Name of *Sethos* must have derived the like denomination of *Sethos* to his Country. So *Theophilus Antiochenus* from *Manetho*: Ἀἰγυπτὸς ὃ ἡ χώρα ἐκλήθη ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως Σέθου· τὸ δὲ ΣΕ'ΘΩΣ φασὶν Αἴγυπτος καλεῖσθαι. Which, being once admitted, will open a further way of expounding *Josephus's* γῆ Σουείδου, which must be reconciled with the place where the *Mercurial Pillars* were placed by *Manetho*, and is by him called Σουείδου. And to derive this yet higher, the usual occasion these emulous Nations took for challenging the glorious *Actions* or *Persons* of each others to themselves, was when themselves also had *Actions* or *Persons* of the same Name. Now *Heliopolis* in *Egypt* was famous for those *Mercurial Writings*.

And

And therefore they who were ambitious of challenging them to themselves, were to take occasion of doing so from a *Heliopolis* of their own. Accordingly the *Chaldeans*, for their *Xisuthrus* pitched on *Heliopolis* in *Sippara*, and the *Phœnicians* had their *Heliopolis* at Mount *Libanus*, a Sacred place, and particularly famous for their *Baitulia*. And when they had, on this pretence, claimed *Mercury* as their own, the change was very obvious, from Σουείδου to Σουείδου, for them who were willing from thence to conclude, that these *Mercurial Pillars* were to be expected only in *Syria*, where their *Heliopolis* was placed. The very Analogy of *Grammar* is sufficient to shew that it was a willful and designed variation. Σουείδου had indeed been *Greek*, but γῆ Σουείδου, though in the Dative Case, seems to have been a change from Σουείδου, as that also from Σουείδου, on the design now mentioned. And there is still a footstep of Σουείδου as the Antientest Reading in *Josephus*, that *Eustathius* reads it Σουείδου, *Hexaem.* And this very Origination of this Word is a strong Presumption that Σουείδου rather than Σουείδου (as some Learned Persons would have it from *Amnian*) is indeed an Antient Reading

C 3

in

Theoph. Antioch. L. III.
ad Autolyc

Ant. I. 3.

Bochart.
Chanaan
L. II. c. 2.

Ammian Marcellin.
L. 22. *Valef.*
in loc. Sir
John Mar-
sham. Chro.
Can. Sec. I.
p. 89. Ed.
Lips.

in *Josephus*. That I may not now mention the Antient Translation of *Josephus* by *Cassiodore*, and as many of the Antients as followed either that or the Greek near those times, who generally take it for Syria on the account now mentioned. I confess I cannot easily distrust *Ammian* in what he says concerning those *Syringes*, where those Sacred Hieroglyphical Inscriptions were, which were designed to be preserved from a deluge, because he pretends to write *visa pleraque*, what he had seen with his own Eyes. I confess I am apt to think that these *Syringes*, were the places designed for the so much celebrated *Pillars* of Mercury, though these Inscriptions were in *Vaults under ground* (those were properly *Syringes*) and in *Walls* rather than *Pillars* (though I know how largely the Notion of *σιναι* may be understood) because I cannot think they had them in two places, for that same reason of preserving them from the *Deluge*. Yet the Country where they were, might have been called *Seriadica*, and that it was so, we have, before *Josephus*, the more Antient Testimony of *Manetho*. Besides it is considerable, that the Doctrine of the two Destructions of the World, one by *Fire*, another by *Water*, which is pretended

tended as the occasion of erecting these two *Pillars*, is originally *Ægyptian*. And they, no doubt on pretence of such *Pillars*, boasted themselves alone to have preserved their *Histories*, through the several *Deluges* and *Conflagrations*. And from this confounding the *Babylonian* and *Ægyptian* accounts, which followed upon their several respective *Emulations*, I suppose it was, that these Inventers of the Fable of *Seth*, were so particular in telling us the very materials of those *Pillars*. The *Ægyptian Syringes* were, as it appears from *Ammian* cut out of a *Quarrey*, and therefore were of solid stone. But the *Babylonian* mentioned by *Epigenes* were *Coctilibus Laterculis*, for which that place was Famous. These two so well fitting the design of preserving them from the *Conflagration* and the *Deluge*, made them, who were willing to confound things for Interests of their own, to be as I said so very particular, not considering that by the account given in *Plato's Timæus*, the *Ægyptians* had another pretence of preserving their own *Inscriptions* from the *Conflagration* as well as from the *Deluge*.

§. XIV. So also, for the *Writings* from whence our *Sanchoniathon* is pretended to have Collected his History, there seems

Vid. *Platon*
in *Tim.* qui
ea habuit
ab *Ægyptiis*

Ammian,
L. XXII.

Ap. *Plin.*
N. H. VII.

56.

little doubt but they were also designed for the same with those of *Mercury*; as also that the Subject of these *Writings*, were taken from those *Plates*, and *Pillars* now mentioned. *Philo Byblius* himself expressly says, that *Sanconiathon* enquired very carefully into the Notions of *Taautus*; That *Taautus*, to whom they were ascribed, was no other than (*) *Mercury*, will, I believe, need no proof. And these *Mystical Books* of the *Ammonians* being joyned with them, makes it yet more probable. For even among our present Counterfeits under the Name of *Mercury*, we have an Epistle of *Asclemus* to *Ammon*, concerning the Concealment of their *Philosophical Mysteries*, with several other Fragments of the like address in *Stobæus Eclog. Phys.* by which we see that those unfaithful dealers with *Hermes*, did both joyn this *Ammon* with him whom they make a King in *Libya*, (very probably with some relation to the Famous *Libyan Oracle* of *Jupiter Ammon*) and withall, made the same *Ammon* a very zealous Patron of those *Philosophical Mysteries*. So that this holds exact correspondence with those other Cheats, and looks as if it belonged to the same Forge. Unless possibly we may refer it to that
more

(*) *Philo Byblius* says so expressly in *Euseb. Pr. Ev. l. 9. p. 32. A.*

more Antient Conjunction of *Thoth* and *Thamuz*, and the God of the *Ægyptian Thebes*, called *Ammon* in *Plato* himself, In *Phædr.* p. 213. whence it comes to pass that the *Ægyptian Thebes* has, in the Prophets, the Name of *No-Ammon*, as it was usual, and, as *Diodorus* observes, most proper to the *Ægyptians*, to denominate their *Cities* from their *Deities*. It may be this may be the reason why the Name of *Ammon* is so usually made use of in the accounts of the *Ægyptian Philosophy*, because the Name it self seems an off-spring of *Ham*, ascribed in the Scripture to the Land of *Ægypt* it self, so that the *Ammonian Philosophy* is no more than a *Colony* of the *Ægyptian*. And these *Ἀποκρυφα Γράμματα*, these *Mystical Writings* were most properly ascribed to this God, whose very Name, as *Manetho* expounds it, signified in the *Ægyptian Tongue*, Ἐν τῷ κεκρυμμένῳ καὶ ἡ κρυψίαν. Ap. *Plutarch. de Is.* & *Osirid.* How much more proper an *Etymology* is this, than that which *Bochart* gives elsewhere from the *Hebrew*, where his Interest for *Sanconiathon*, obliges him to make these *Ammonian Writings Phœnician?* De *Phœn.* Col. 11. 17.

§. XV. But to examine now the Credibility of his pretence to these Means; it is first considerable that, seeing these *Records* were *Ægyptian*, it is not easie to explain

plain how *Sanchoiathon* himself, a Man of another Nation, could have access to them. The difficulty *Pythagoras* found notwithstanding the powerful recommendation of *Polycrates* to *Amasis* who was his *Hofpes*, shews how averse they were to communicate their *Mysteries* to *For-reigners*. But it was not at all to be expected by Persons *uncircumcized*, as the *Phœnicians* were undoubtedly in the pretended Age of *Sanchoiathon*. But sup-
 posing he had Conquered the difficulties of access, and submitted, as *Pythagoras* seems to have done, to Circumcision; yet the *Mystical Books* of the *Ammonians*, and much more the *Mystical Hieroglyphicks* of the *Ægyptians*, (of which kind the Sacred *Inscriptions* of their *Pillars* generally were,) depended still on a higher degree of *good will* and *fidelity* of the *Priests* for their *Explication*. And who can undertake that they would, after all, deal *Faithfully* with him? Especially if they had suspected the least design in him of committing them to *Writing*, and *divulging* them to *Posterity*? And after all, what judicious Person would not rather enquire for this Information *Originally* from the *Ægyptians* themselves? Who would not rather have trusted *their present*
 sense

Porphy. de
 vit. Pythag.
 p. 183. vid.
 Not. Hol-
 sten.

sense in which they were agreed, even in later times, than such *Second-hand* Relations concerning the sense of their *Ancestors*? And then, what will become of this so much applauded Testimony of *Sanchoiathon*, if *Phœnician* matters must not be expected from him, as they could not from such means of Information; and if the Testimony even of the later *Ægyptians* must be preferred before him? I am very well aware that the whole credit of this Author depends on the contrary supposition, that both these *Pillars* of *Taan-tus*, and *Apocryphal Books* of the *Ammonians*, were in *Phœnicia*; and concerned *Phœnician* Affairs, and in the *Phœnician* Tongue or *Characters*, that a Native *Phœnician* might be presumed fittest to understand them.

§. XVI. THIS will indeed, and will alone, make him so *credible* as he is thought to be. And it is plainly supposed in the Author himself, who makes *Hermes* a Native *Phœnician*, and to be made *King* of *Ægypt* by one that was. And this seems the most likely account how the *Pillars* of *Seth* (which I said seem to be the same with those of *Mercury*) came to be placed by *Josephus* in *Syria*, that he had met them placed there
 by

Apud Euseb.
 Pr. Ev. 1.
 10. p. 36. A.
 39. B.

by some who were thus in Interest, concerned to place them so, to justify their other Fictions. Besides *τῷ Σνεαδινῷ* in *Manetho* was easily corrupted into *Σνεαδινῷ* in *Josephus*, by them who were willing to have it so, as has already been observed. And the *Ægyptian* Name of *Seth*, so exactly agreeing with the *Hebrew* Name, was a likely occasion of mistake, and an *Argument* too, for them who had rather have him believed to be a *Hebrew* than an *Ægyptian*. But then against this I oppose all the contrary, both *Testimonies* and *Arguments* that might be produced to prove that *Hermes* was a Native *Ægyptian*, and that *Ægypt* was never so subdued by the *Phœnicians* as to receive, nor *Phœnicia* in such a strong and flourishing condition, as to give them a *King* of their own Nation. That is as many *Testimonies*, as there are or have been *Ægyptian* Writers, not only *after*, but *before* the publishing of this pretended *Sanchoniathon*; as many of them, at least, as mention such a Person as *Hermes*, as many of them as wrote before these Disputes of Antiquity of Nations were started, as well as they who wrote afterwards, to abet parties now made, and to drive on designs by this time already formed to their hand.

hand. The highest account of all the *De Nat. Mercuries* in *Cicero's* time, that was given *Deor. L. III* by them who had then the curiosity to enquire into the *Gods* of the *same Name*, amounted not to above five, and among them no mention of any one that was a *Phœnician*, a sign none such was so much as challenged by them, till this pretended *Sanchoniathon*. The same account is followed by others afterwards, by *Ampelius* and *Arnobius*, a sign that even *then* this fictitious *Phœnician* was not of that credit, *Arnob. adv. Gent. L. IV.* as to be thought worthy to encrease the received Number. And these were sufficient to be opposed to the true *Sanchoniathon* himself. The Original Writings of *Taautus*, and the *Mystical Books* of the *Ammonians* must have been theirs, and could have been Interpreted by none but them, if we will allow any thing to the concurrent *Testimonies* of *disinterested* Antiquity. But how much more than sufficient are they to over-sway the *Vouchers* for *him*, and for all those *things* also which recommend him as so very creditable? How much Antienter? How much freer from design? That I may not now descend to Personal Comparisons.

§. XVII. But, (possibly to avoid the difficulty to be supposed in understanding Writings

Writings of this Nature;) it is supposed that *Taautus* either *found* or *made* all things clear; that he Originally wrote them so whatever he wrote upon his own knowledge; that he *made* them so, where he did not, as in his discovery of these *Mystical Books* of the *Ammonians*, from some Monuments of their own, concealed in their *Adyta*, and of difficult access, but yet procured and divulged by him; that he unriddled the *Tales* and *Allegories*, wherein they had been Originally concealed. But that the later *Priests* again retrieved their *Mythologies* and Arts of concealment. That as for the *Mercurial Books* themselves the Son of *Thabion* was the first who turned them into *Allegory*, from whom they came to the *Greeks*. That many Generations afterwards *Surmubelus*, the God (I suppose so Sur-named like *Antiochus*, and *Diodorus Cronus* the *Philosopher*, from *Saturn*, and *Pior* the *Ægyptian* from *Apollo*, that I may instance also in *private Persons* who were *Sur-named* from *Gods*, not only *denominatively*,) and *Thuro* a Woman Sur-named *Chusarthis*, explained those *Allegories*. That by this means they might come clear to *Sanhoniathon* from *Writings*, without Personal Discoveries of the *Priests*, which was

Sanhon.
apud *Euf.*
Pr. Ev. l. 9.
p. 32. B.

Ap. Euf. ib.
p. 39. C.

Ib. p. 40. B.

was not to be expected. This seems contrived, as if it were on purpose to defend the Credit of these Informations.

§. XVIII. BUT how many things are here supposed no way consistent with the Notions of those times? We see it is acknowledged that the Arts of *concealment* of *Mysteries*, had been taken up and used before, because *Taautus* is said to have unriddled those of the *Ammonians*. And who knows not how great a *Piaculum* it was thought to *divulge Mysteries*? How particularly Superstitious the *Antients* were that way, as appears from the Fables of *Phineus* and *Prometheus*? And (concerning the *Ægyptians*) from their Worship of *Harpocrates*? How it was Capital for the Person who endeavoured it, and how they would no doubt have *suppressed* such Publications of their *Mysteries* if it lay in their power to do so? How then could *Sanhoniathon* come by them who lived so many Ages after? Was it because they *could not* suppress all Copies of what had once escaped them at *first*, especially not such as were in the Hands of the *Phœnicians*, who were not obnoxious to their Jurisdiction? But would they, at least, have paid that *Honour* to the Memory of a Person guilty of a crime then reputed

reputed so very *impious* as to make him a *God*? Would they not rather have erected *Pillars* to his disgrace (from whence came afterwards the popular notion of *Σηλιδεύ*) than borrowed all their *Sacred Rites* and *Inventions* from his *Books* or *Pillars*? Would they have ascribed all their *Solemnities* of *Religion* (as it appears they did from *Clemens Alexandrinus*) to such a *Prophaner* of their *Secrets*, to so *impious* a violator of their received *Religion*?

§. XIX. AND who indeed was more unlikely to have such an accusation laid to his charge, than he that was reputed the First Institutor of their *Religion*, the first Imposer of that *Sacred silence* which they took for so necessary a Duty of all that would pretend to be *Religious*? Why should they ascribe their *Hieroglyphicks* and their *Sacred Characters* to him, if they had not thought that he had invented them purposely for this concealment? But consider him even as the Inventor only of their *Letters* (an Invention expressly ascribed to him by this pretended *Sanchoniaton* himself) and they cannot shew it possible for him to make that discovery he is pretended to have made from the very *Writings* of the *Ammonians*. For all other

Strom. vi.

*Sacrarum
literarum
peritos fa-
cit. Jul.
Firmic.
Mathef.
Lib. III.
c. 8.
Euseb. Pr.
Ev. l. 10. p.
35. A.*

other *Sacred* wayes but *Letters*, were of so æquivocal signification, as nothing could be gathered from them without the *Oral Traditions* of their *Priests*. And therefore he could not have made so great Discoveries by *Books*, if himself were the first Inventor of *Letters*.

§. XX. BUT who is this Son of *Thabion*, who is said to have turned them back into *Allegories*, and from whom they came at last to the *Greeks*? I suppose *Agathodæmon*, or the Second *Mercury* the Father of *Tat*, who is said by *Manetho* to have Translated the Books of the said *Elder Mercury* into *Greek*, but yet *Γεγραμμένον ἱερογλυφικοῖς*, that is in the *Sacred* *Ægyptian Letter*, contradistinct from that which was of common use, possibly that though the *words* were, yet the *Characters* might not be understood by the *Greeks* without the *Priests* assistance, which he also secured by placing them in the *Adyta*. All these things seem exactly to agree with the present Fragments of the *Mercurial Writings* in *Greek*, where the *Elder Mercury* is blamed by *Ammon* for divulging their *Mysteries*; where the *Second Mercury* is he who generally speaks in his own Person, the *Elder* is spoken of in the *Third*, and *Tat* is mentioned as his *Son*, and the *Μυστήριον ἀποκρυφόμενον* is so of-

Ap. Euseb.
Gr. p. 6. Ed.
Scaliger.

ten mentioned, where the very *Pillars* are mentioned, and that they were to be *divulged* to Posterity from those *Pillars*, as appears from a Fragment of them extant in *Stobæus*. Yet it does not appear that *Manetho* published that Text of those *Mercurial Books* he pretends to have used out of the *Sacred Ægyptian*, into the common *Greek Character*. That he might forbear to do as a *Priest*. Possibly *Numenius* might have contributed hereunto, who is therefore charged by his own *Heathen Brethren* for divulging *Mysteries*. Whoever did so, seems also to have enlarged those of *Manetho*, with other things he took for *Mercurial*, as will appear hereafter. However these very allusions to these *Greek Mercurials*, are sufficient to convict this pretended *Sanchoniathon* of *falsehood*, in the opinion of such as believe the *Mercurials* themselves to be *Forgeries*, and *Forgeries* much later than the time that *Sanchoniathon* pretends to. However, if they were again involved by this Second *Hermes*, how comes *Sanchoniathon* to have understood them? But if this *Surmubelus* and *Thuro* had extricated them before the time of *Sanchoniathon*, how comes *Orpheus* (who must have been *Elder* or contemporary with him, if he flourished at, or a little before, the War of *Troy*, and

Stob. Eclog. Phys.

Macrob. in somn. Scipion. L. I. c. 2.

and who is generally supposed to have borrowed his Notions from the *Ægyptians*,) not to have understood them free from *Allegories*, as well as this pretended *Sanchoniathon*? But to proceed.

§. XXI. HE is pretended also to have borrowed his Informations from *Hierom-baal* the *Priest* of the God *Jevo*. There is little reason to doubt but that he meant *Gideon*, who was by his Father *Joash* Sur-named *Jerubbaal*. The putting of *H* *Jud. vi. 32* before *Hebrew* words beginning with *I*, (that is, putting *Aspirations* where in the Original, the *J* is Consonant,) is so common, that I believe none will doubt of it. Instances are very obvious, as in *Hieremias*, *Hierusalem*, *Hiericho*, &c. And the M S. *Greek* *υ* is as easie to have been mistaken for a *u*, which is their Mark for *e*. which is an ordinary occasion of mistake in multitudes of MSS. Especially in the less skillful *Publishers* of Printed Books from MSS. and this Name is at this present Written *Jerobaal*, with an *o* in the *Vulgar Latin Text*, *Judg. vi. 32*. And almost as little reason is there to doubt, but that the Name *Jevo*, is only a *Greek* imitation of the *Tetragrammaton*, the middle and final *Aspirations* being utterly unexpressible in the *Greek Tongue*. But

D 2

neither

neither is this account of his Information, any thing more creditable than the others. How could *Gideon* be a *Priest*, who was of the Tribe of *Manasseh*? Was it on account of the *Ephod* which *Gideon* made? But where is there the least intimation that he wore it himself? Nay, when he is said to have placed it in his own City of *Ephra*, it seems to imply, that it was placed there for another's wearing. And how comes it to pass, that the Scripture should pass it over in silence, that is so punctual in taking notice of Violations of the *Priesthood*, in matters of lesser consequence in *Jeroboam* and others? But how could *Sanchoniathon* have been guilty of such a mistake, in so fresh a memory of *Gideon*, in so near a Neighborhood of the *Jews*, in a matter wherein then the meanest of them could have informed him, (so careful they were then to keep up the memory of their *Tribes*,) if he had been so diligent in procuring Information, as is pretended? Suppose he had been so negligent himself; yet, how could King *Abibalus*, to whom he is said to have Dedicated his Book? How could all his contemporary Enquirers after Truth, from all whom, he is pretended to have received commendations, be yet all so mistaken

Οἱ καὶ
αὐτὸν ἐξε-
τάσαι ὃ
ἀληθεύας
Verba Por-
phyrii ap.
Euseb. Pr.
Ev. 19.31.
A.

staken in a thing of so easie Information? Yet to make this fancy concerning *Gideon's Priesthood* look more likely, the excellent *Bochart* conceives that the *Baal Berith*, with whom the *Israelites* committed *Idolatry* after the death of *Gideon*, must have been the God of *Berytus*, *Sanchoniathon's* own City. But it seems most likely, that this *Baal Berith* was the God (not the *Goddeſs*) to whom *Gideon's Ephod* was Consecrated, at his own City *Ephra*. That *Ephod* is said to have been a *snare* to *Him* and his *Family*. And accordingly this *Baal Berith's* Temple, furnished the *Sichemites* with Arms in their Conspiracy with *Abimelech*, which proved the ruine of the greatest part of *Gideon's* Family. If so, then there was no ground to make this *Baal Berith* the same with *Jao*, to whom *Philo Byblius* would have us believe that *Gideon* was *Priest*. However, there is no probability that *Berith* (if it must needs be the name of a place,) could be the same with *Berytus*. This *Berith*, where the *Sichemites* dwelt was in all likelihood under the Dominion of the *Israelites*, but *Berytus* was in *Phœnicia*, and was in *Sanchoniathon's* time (if we may believe *Philo Byblius*) under a distinct King from *Israel*. Besides the different

Ph. Col. 11.

17.

Judg. viii

33.

Judg. viii

27.

Judg. iv. 4.

ferent ways of writing these words in the *Hebrew*, gives little occasion for such a mistake. The *Phœnician Berytus* was so called as *Stephanus* tells us, rather from *בֵּרִית* *dia* τὸ ἐνυδρον, βήρ τὸ φέρειν παρ' αὐτοῖς. And it is observable, that *Stephanus* seems to have taken what he had concerning these *Phœnician* places, from *Philo Byblius* himself, as might have been shewn in several Instances, and is on another occasion confessed by *Bochart* himself. If this were taken from him also, then it will at least follow, that this affinity between the Names of *Berith* and *Berytus*, could have been no occasion of mistake to *Philo Byblius*. Which as to our present purpose, is of much greater consequence, than what that same Learned Person observes from *Nonnus*, who takes *Berytus* for *Beroe*, the Daughter of *Venus* and *Adonis*. This therefore, looks like one of those ill-meant Blunders, which those Modern *Greeks* were ordinarily guilty of in the *Jewish History*, who pretended, no doubt from the like Records, to give other accounts of them, than their own writings had done of themselves, only with a design to asperse their Nation. Thus *Moses* is made a Woman, called *Moso* by *Alexander Polyhistor*. *Moses* and *Joseph* are

Phœn. Col.
II. 12.

Suid. Met.
σδ. ap. Jo-
seph. c. Ap.
I. 1057.

joyned

joyned together as *contemporaries* in *Cheremon*. But *Moses* is the Son of *Joseph* ^{Just. Hist. xxxvi. 2.} in *Trogus Pompeius*, Epitomiz'd by *Justin*. Many more Instances might have been given, if it had been necessary. Nor will the Answer of *Bochart* serve to excuse him here. *בר* may indeed alone signify a *Prince* as well as a *Priest*. But when it is joyned with the *God*, to whom he is said to have been *Priest*, that were alone sufficient to determine the signification, from any ambiguity of which it might otherwise have been capable. But besides I shall (*) hereafter have occasion to shew (*) § 38. his design in making him a *Priest*, for recommending what he was to deliver on his *Testimony*.

§. XXII. But possibly his pretended *Memoires* of *Gideon*, might have given him the Title of *Priest*, and *Sanchoniathon* a *Stranger*, a likely occasion of such a mistake. If they did so, then this itself had been a sufficient Argument, that they could not have been *Gideon's*. And then, what credit must that part of his History be of, which relies on so uncreditable Informations? And indeed, how unlikely is it, that *Gideon* should have left such *Memoires* behind him? In all likelihood, what had come from him,

D 4

would

would have been *accounted Prophetical*; at least, if it had been undoubted, would have been made so by the attestation of the *Sanhedrim*, who were by God himself established for the Authentical *Judges of Prophets*. Which is the most defensible way for asserting the Divinity of the *Anonymous Authors of the Old Testament*. And if so, what probability had there been of their miscarriage? Nay, supposing them only *Humane*, and of no higher repute among the *Jews*; yet, who can think they would have neglected so precious a Monument of their *Antiquity*, from so sure a hand as *Gideon's*? But there is not the least *Memory* of such a work among the *Jews*, not in their *Canonical Histories*; not in the multitudes even of *Counterfeits*, that were Antient, or were ever received, even among the *Hellenists*, of which we have any account, either in the Antient *Stichometriae*, or in any Antient *Quotations*; not so much as in any *Quotation* of those *Canonical Writers* that lived near those times, and quote several extant then, which have since miscarried, as the Book of *Jather*, of the *Wars of the Lord*, &c. Not even in the Book of *Judges*, where his Testimony had been most useful for continuing the *Jewish History*,

History, from the death of *Joshua*, to his own time. Can we think they would thus generally have neglected him, if they had known him, or thought him *Genuine*? Can we think the *Phœnicians* would have valued him, if his own *Country-men* had so neglected him?

§. XXIII. Certainly, if he ever had any such *Memoires*, or made use of them any where, it must have been, most probably, where he gives account of *Jewish* matters. But his accounts concerning them, are so full of *mistakes*, of mistakes so inconsistent even with *Jewish* Interest, as could not, with any probability, have been occasioned by any *Jewish* Testimonies; much less by so grave and unexceptionable a Testimony as that of *Gideon*. I have had occasion to mention one instance already, that of his making *Gideon* a *Priest*. And such generally are the rest of his accounts of *Jewish* affairs, as far as we can judge of them, by the few Fragments preserved to us by *Porphyry*. He makes *Abraham* a Native *Phœnician*, and the same with the *Greek* *Saturn*, who bestowed *Attica* on *Minerva*. What *Jew* would have rob'd his Nation of their *Father Abraham* they so much boasted of, would have derived them from the *Uncircumcised*

By the
Name of
Saturn ap.
Eus. Pr. Ev.
l. 10. p. 36.
C. p. 38. D.

cumcised Philistines, so much abhorred and despised by them? Would have dishonoured *Abraham* himself, so far as to have made him a *Heathen Deity*, a thing so detested by the *Jews*? He makes him *actually* Sacrifice his Son. It is plain what Interest obliged him to say so, *viz.* that he might hereby give an account of that Antient, but Inhumane Custom, of *Sacrificing* their own Children to him, under the name of *Saturn* or *Moloch*. For this was generally the design of the *Heathen Mysteries*, to commemorate some memorable Action of their *Deity*. Thus the pleasure that *Ceres* took in the obscene behaviour of *Baubo*, was commemorated in the *Eleusinian Mysteries*. And the like delight that *Hercules* took in the *Plow-man's Curses*, when he was eating his *Plow-Oxen*, was also remembred with the like *Curses* still repeated in the Solemnities of the Worship of *Hercules*. But what ground could he have in doing so, from the *Old Testament*? He might indeed from the later *Mystical* Expositions of the *Hellenists*, who speak of it as done, because it was reckoned to him as done in the *Divine acceptance*, *Gen. xxii. 16.* Therefore *St. Paul* sayes he *Offered him*, *Heb. xi. 17.* adding withall, that he re-

ceived

ceived him from *Death in a Figure*, *v. 19.* And the expression of having actually offered him, is also used by *St. Clemens* in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*. If it were hence that he derived his mistake, that will also prove him Counterfeited about the time he was first produced. He gives also different accounts of the reason why *Abraham* should have offered his Son.

Sometimes, *κινδυνῶν ἐν πλέμει μεγίστων κατελη-* P. 40. D.
φόντων ἢ χάραν, sometimes again, *λοιμῶν ῥομένων* P. 38. D.
καὶ φθορᾶς. I know not whether any occasion of the former account, might have been taken from *2 Kings iii. 27.* *Am. i. 16.* where the King of *Moab* being pressed by distress of *War*, offer'd a *First-born Son*; but not his own, but the King of *Edoms*. But there is no pretence of either in *Abraham's* case from any *Jewish* Records, nor consequently could he have these different Informations from the *Memoires* of *Gideon*, unless we can suppose them, not only different from all the Authentick Records of his *Nation*, but from themselves also, these things being the Principal in this Author, that concern the *Jews*, and yet, being so impossible to have been taken from any *Memoires* of *Gideon*, make me verily suspect, that the Forger of this Author himself, as he did

not

not *use*, so neither did he know of any such *Memoires*, either truly or pretendedly passing under the Name of *Gideon*, at least, not owned for such among the *Jews*. Which as it is a clear conviction of his designed dissingenuity in a matter not excusable by any pretence of Ignorance; so it will render him justly liable to a suspicion of a like dissingenuity in his other fair pretences, though we had not the like evidence of conviction of them. At least no such pretences to means of Information must be trusted on his *word*, and there is no better pretended for them.

§. XXIV. BUT, to let the Informations alone, the work it self affords Intrinsick Arguments enough of just suspicion. A great occasion of the *Forgeries* of those times, was the *Emulation* of several Nations, for glory of Inventions and Antiquity. Hence it came to pass, that of all glorious Inventions, and of all Famous Persons, so very different and inconsistent accounts are given by the *Historians* of the several Rival Nations, each of them challenging them for their own. Hence such a multitude of *Jupiters*, *Hercules's*, *Æsculapius's*, *Diana's*, &c. nay, and of *Homers* too, different not only in Nati-

on,

on, but in Age too, yet pretending generally to the glory of the same Actions. It must needs be, that of so inconsistent reports concerning the same Person, all but one must have been not mistakes, but designed *Forgeries*. Which I therefore note to shew that, as it was not unusual, so neither was it new, to *Forge* on such occasions. Yet they pretended generally to honest means of Information. Now this pretended *Sanchoniathon*, is full of this vanity of arrogating useful Inventions and Persons to his own *Phœnicia*. Which, as they will prove him *later* than these *Æmulations* of several Nations about Antiquity, much later than the time pretended for the true *Sanchoniathon*; so they will expose him to all the *Testimonies* and *Arguments* that may be produced for the several Nations against him in *all*, or *any* of the respective Particulars. If he can be disproved or charged with indirect dealing in any one particular, that will be sufficient to weaken his credit in all the rest. Let us come therefore to the particulars.

XXV. THUS he ascribes the Invention of Iron, to the *Phœnician* *Χρυσῶς*, in all likelihood, the same with *Χρυσῶς* in *Hesiod*, whom he makes the Famous *Vulcan*; where-

as

Ap. Euseb.
Pr. Ev. l. 10
p. 35. C.

as the *Scripture* attributes the same to *Tubal Cain*, and the *Græcians* to the *Idæi Daëtyli*, not long before the Wars of *Troy*. For there we find that all the *Arms* of the *Heroes*, both *offensive* and *defensive*, were of *Brass*, as appears by *Homer*, and is observed by the *Scholiast*, on *Apolloni- us Rhodius* and *Pausanias*, which are great suspicions that the Invention of *Iron* was late, because it had not as yet reached those Parts. But it is indeed strange, that *Vulcan* should here be taken for a *Phæni- cian*, who is by the *Ægyptians*, reported to have been the notorious Original of the first Generation of their *Deified Kings*; The design of which *Deifying* being observed by this *Philo* himself, to have been the honour of some profitable Invention for Humane Life, will make it likewise probable, that he was also taken for the *Inventor* of *Fire* and *Iron*. There were indeed several *Vulcans* observed by the *Antients*, but not above *Four*, and among them none that appears to have been thought *Phænician*. Thus also he makes *Magus* the Son of the *Ἄλφῶ* and *Titanes*, which were accounted bad *Dæ- mons*. Who sees not here an instance of that ordinary vanity of the *Græcians*, of turning the *Name* of the *Sect* into a pro- per

per Name of a *Man*, and thence pretend- ing to give an account of their first Institu- tion? Who sees not a plain design to rob the *Chaldeans* of the *Magi*, and to make them a *Phænician* Invention? Which let him believe, who can find in his heart to do so. I need not to observe, that the whole *Sect* of the *Magi*, if they were first Instituted by the *Chaldean Zoroastres*, (who seems to have lived near the time of *Pythagoras*, and is said by some to have conversed with him) they must have been Instituted long after the time of our pretended *Sanchoniathon*, and therefore could not have been taken notice of by him. As for the *Bactrian Zoroastres*, I doubt the very pretending to him was only such another design of robbing the *Chaldeans* of him. *Diodorus* calls him *Oxyartes*, and that was, it may be, his true Name. I might also observe, that when he makes this *Magus* the Son of those bad *Dæmons*, he evidently alludes to the bad sense of the Name of *Magus*, which was yet very much later than the Institution of the *Sect* it self.

§. XXVI. He also makes the *Dioscuri*, not only *Phænicians*, but the same also with the *Corybantes* and *Curetes*. It is evident he could not understand the *Castores*,

L. II. Bibl.
ex ctesia.

Ap. Euseb.
ib. p. 36. A.

Castores, who were not only later than *Sanchoniathon*, but than those *Curetes* and *Corybantes* also. The most candid sense that can be put upon it, is by the name *Dioscuri* to understand, not the *Sons*, but the *Nurses* of *Jupiter*. So indeed the word *νεύειν* is used in *Hesiod* for *Nursing*. And so the *Curetes* or *Corybantes*, are in Truth, said to have *Nursed* him in the *Antrum Idaeum*. But then, the word being *Greek*, could not have been known to the *Phœnician Sanchoniathon*; and what word must have answered it in his Original *Phœnician*, is not easie to guess. Nor do I know why *Philo* should use it in so unusual a Notion, which yet he elsewhere uses for them absolutely, without the explicatory Addition of the Titles of *Curetes* or *Corybantes*. And is not this a plain design upon the *Cretan Jupiter*, to make him, as well as his *Nurses*, Originally *Phœnician*? But this may possibly be thought excusable as an *Interpolation* of the *Translator*, who must at least, have been the Author of that *Greek* word. For it seems evident, not only from this, but

words, *Δαζών* ὡς ὅτι
, p. 36. because *Ζῆς*
, p. 37. *Οὐρανός*,
, *Εἰμύς*, &c. & p. 39.
he quotes *Hesiod*, &c.

the mention of several other
Greek words, and of the
Greek Nation, nay, of the
very *Alexandrians*, that he
did

did use the liberty, rather of a *Paraphrast*, than of a faithful accurate *Translator*. But then, how shall we be able to distinguish between his *Interpolations*, and the *Text* of his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. It seems also strange, that these *Corybantes* or *Cabiri*, or *Samothraces*, which, by the *Græcians* account of them, seem to have been the same, and to have accompanied the *Mater Deorum* out of *Phrygia* into *Crete*, should here be made immediately *Phœnicians*, though I am apt to believe indeed that their *Mysteries* had some *Ori-*
ginally-Phœnician ingredients. But it is *Bochart. de Phœn. Con. 12.* yet more strange, how they should have found *Crete* Inhabited; where they must have *Nursed*, or at least, *received Jupiter*, if themselves had been the first *Inventors of Ships*, as is here pretended, unless possibly they made use of those hard shifts, which are here also mentioned, as invented before. Which yet is hardly credible of so great a *Multitude* as might be thought sufficient to People the whole Island. *ib. p. 36. A.*

§. XXVII. Other instances there are of the like *Vanity* and *Affectation* in this Author. Some I have had occasion to touch at formerly. Who can endure to see (1) *Abraham*, to see the famous *Ægypti-*
an *P. 40. C.*

36. an (*) *Hermes*, made Original *Phœnici-*
 9.B. *ans*? This alone, one would think, were
 sufficient to overthrow those great Elo-
 gies that are given him for his *Faith-*
 A. *fulness* and *Diligence*, but this is not all.
Jupiter Belus, the Famous Founder of
 the *Assyrian* Monarchy, *Typhon* the Bro-
 ther of the Famous *Ægyptian Osiris*,
 must also be made Originally *Phœnici-*
ans; than which what can be more cer-
 tainly false, if any thing be certain in the
Antient Assyrian or *Ægyptian Histories*?
 So must also *Adodus* the Father of *Ben-*
hadad King of *Syria* in the *Scripture*, and
 in *Trogus Pompeius*, and Worshipped by
 the *Syrians* for a God. So must *Æscu-*
 ians. *lapius*, whose Sons were *Peloponnesians*,
 a. in and on that account present at the War
 P. of *Troy*; besides that himself is reported
 Corin. to have been the Son of *Arfinoe* the
 & Daughter of *Leucippus* a *Messenian*. So
 must also *Minerva*, if she had *Attica* be-
 stowed on her by the *Phœnician Saturn*.
 But when were the *Phœnicians* so famous
 for their Conquests, as to have so great
 and remote Dominions as *Ægypt*, *Assyria*
 and *Attica* at their disposal: What writ-
 ter, even of their own, however partial
 to his own Country, did so much as pre-
 tend it before our pretended *Sancho-*
thon?

thon? But it is a strange mistake in *Chro-*
nology (in which it seems to have been
 a special Providence of God for their
 Discovery, that *Counterfeiters* have gene-
 rally been unskillful) that she should be
 made contemporary, or rather
 later (*) than *Æsculapius*, as
 will appear by our Authors
 computation; whereas *Æscu-*
lapius flourished, as I said be-
 fore, but little before the War
 of *Troy*, but *Minerva* strove
 with *Neptune*, for the Domini-
 on of *Attica* in the time of *Ce-*
crops Diphys, some hundreds
 of years before. There were in-
 deed several *Minervæ*, and *Æs-*
culapii pretended by them, who
 had the curiosity to enquire in-
 to them, in order to the expo-
 sing them. But this very pretence of a
Multitude, was later than the times of
Æmulation, and yet none of those Multi-
 tudes pretended to have been *Phœnicians*.
 The passage of *Damascius* concerning a
Phœnician Æsculapius, seems plainly
 Transcribed from *Philo Byblius*, and there-
 fore ought not to be taken for a distinct
 Authority.

(*) For she is made the
 Daughter of *Saturn*,
 p. 36. D. But *Esculapius*
 is made the Son of *Sy-*
duc, the Brother of *Mi-*
for, whose Son *Mercury*
 is said to have been
 Counsellor to *Saturn* as
 soon as he was come to
 Mans Estate, p. 36. D.
 And the Posterity of the
Dioscuri are made con-
 temporary with *Saturn*
 p. 37. B. Which *Dioscuri*
 themselves were Sons
 of *Syduc*, and conse-
 quently Brethren to *Æs-*
culapius. See p. 36. A.

Damasc. vit.
Isidor. ap.
Phit. Cod.
ccxlii. p.
1073.

§. XXVIII. AND why should *Abraham*, if he were the *Phœnician Saturn*, *Circumcise* himself, as this Author also pretends, when it is so well known, that the Antient *Phœnicians* were so averse to it, that a long time after *Abraham's* death, they are still stigmatized by the name of the *uncircumcized Philistines*? But the design is plain. He had a mind to challenge a Person of such Note for his Country-man; and because the Story of *Abraham's* making a Covenant with God by *Circumcision*, was one of the most memorable passages of that Great Man's Life, therefore he thought it fit to assert it to their *Saturn*. And it may be the rather, because by this time, when this work was Counterfeited, the *Phœnicians* themselves seem also to have received *Circumcision* from the *Ægyptians*. Who knows but that such Tales as these might have been the reason why *Abraham* was Worshipped at *Mamre*, for some considerable time before *Constantine* who first forbad it, with *Idols* and *Sacrifices*; by *Gentiles* as well as *Christians*; by *Phœnicians* as well as those of *Palestine* and *Arabia*? That *Humane Sacrifices* were not among those as they are particularized by *Sozomen*, (though they were otherwise the properest

perest for the *Phœnician Saturn*) there was very good reason, because they had been, long before that time, forbidden by *Roman Laws*. The First *Roman Law* against them was at *Rome*, *An. II. C. 657*. *Cn. Cornelius Lentulus* and *P. Licinius Crassus* being ⁽¹⁾ *Consuls*. After that it ^(1 2) *Plin. Nat. Hist. xxx. c. 1.* was particularly forbidden the *Druids* by ⁽²⁾ *Tiberius*, at last forbidden every where by the Emperour ⁽³⁾ *Hadrian*. ⁽³⁾ *Porphyr. de Abst. II. 56.* Besides that by the account *Philo Byblius* himself, as well as other Writers of *Phœnician* affairs, give concerning them; these *Humane Sacrifices*, by the Rules of the *Phœnicians* themselves, seem not to have been ordinary, but only reserved for some very great *distress*, as an *expiation* to that *angry Demon*. But all these instances do abundantly shew how extreamly partial this Author was, in adorning his own Nation with the spoils of others. Which is not reconcileable either with the *Veracity* or *Antiquity* of the true *Sanchoniathon*. Nor will any supposable mistakes of *Philo* in *Translating* him, serve to bring him off in so gross and designed instances concerning his *Neighbours* and the *Famous Persons* now mentioned. For they concern *Things*, not *Words* and *Expressions*; Things very notorious, not

only of *Probable* or *Conjectural* Evidence.

§. XXIX. I cannot therefore but think this Author Counterfeited purposely with a design of confronting the *Antiquity* of the *Scripture*. But who was the *Impostor*, whether *Philo Byblius* or *Porphry*, that I confess I cannot easily determine. I confess I should rather charge it on *Porphry*, the abusing of the Name of *Philo*, as well as that of *Sanctionation*, were it not for that only Testimony of *Athenæus*, and I have given my reasons why I should otherwise have thought it improbable that *Philo* was the Author of that *Translation*. But because I cannot tell what to say to that express Quotation of *Athenæus* before the time of *Porphry*, I doubt *Philo* will not easily be discharged of it. For by his Exceptions against the Testimony of *Hecateus* for what he had Written in favour of the *Jews*, That either his work must have been counterfeited; or if genuine, that he himself must have been carried away by the *plausibility* of the *Jewish pretences*: It appears that he was engaged in that Dispute concerning the *Antiquity* of the *Jews*, and engaged against the *Jews*, and therefore was a Person sufficiently interested to set on such a disingenuous

genuous design as far as his *Principles* would give him leave. And I have already shewn how far *Platonical Principles* did so. If I may venture to guess in a matter that affords no better Arguments than guesses, I should suspect that *Josephus's* Books against *Appion* were the occasion of engaging *Philo* on this Subject. What *Josephus* had there produced in defence of the *Antiquity* of the *Jews*, was very probably the *μετανοίας* alluded to by *Philo*. I cannot think any other was meant, because *Josephus* seems to have been the *first* that engaged in that Dispute, (he does not intimate in the least that any had engaged in it before him) and because the time was so short between *Josephus* and *Philo*, that there could hardly be any new occasion for any one else to undertake that cause that *Josephus* had so very lately, and so accurately defended. For *Josephus* wrote his Books against *Appion* immediately after his *Antiquities* and his *Life*, in the Thirteenth year of *Domitian*, because he Dedicated these also to the same *Epaphroditus*, who was put to Death in the year following; and *Philo* seems to have written under *Hadrian*. Besides the fame of *Josephus*, with all well-wishers to Learning, and the Eminent capacities

pacities he served in, both among his own *Country-men*, and in the Courts of the *Vespasians*, added no doubt a greater Authority to what came from him, and recommended it to the Reading of all curious Persons, not now to mention the attestations of the *Emperours*, and of King *Agrippa*, and of other Learned Men, *Heathens* as well as others, among whom himself reckons *Julius Archelaus* and *He-*

C. App. 1. rod. And this very Testimony of *Hecateus*, which it seems so gravelled *Philo*, had been produced, and insisted on, in this very work by *Josephus*. Which will therefore make it very probable, that this Work of *Philo Byblius* against the *Jews*, was designed in answer to *Josephus* against *Appion*.
C. App. 1. rod. 1037. F.

Cont. Appion. L. 1. p. 1048. B. 11. p. 1063 F.

§. XXX. WHICH being supposed, I consider further that *Josephus* in that same Work had principally insisted on the Testimonies of *Phœnicians* and *Ægyptians*, for proving the *Antiquity* of his own *Nation*, as of those who had best reason to know them; but the *Phœnicians* most of all, as being nearest. Accordingly he Appeals not only to their *Writers* that were extant, but their *Written Records*, their *Ἀναγχαῖ*, which were preserved to that very time. This could not choose but

Cont. App. L. 1. p. 1039. C.

C. Appion. L. 1. p. 1043. F. Antiq. viii. p. 258. F. C. Appion. p. 1042.

but particularly move *Philo Byblius* as being himself a *Phœnician*, and who might very well have known *Josephus* himself, if he were Three score and Eighteen years old, at the Two hundred and Twentieth *Olympiad*, as has been observed out of *Su-idas*, though possibly the odd number of the *Olympiad*, above Two hundred and twenty, which is requisite to make him live to Write concerning the Empire of *Hadrian*, is wanting. I mention not *Scaliger's* *Ἀναγχαῖ* which tells us more particularly, not the *Olympiad* only, but also the very year wherein he conceives him to have Written, because it is of no Authority. But there was another thing that added further to the reputation of the *Jews* about that time. Their *Essenes* had been in great reputation with as many as had occasion to hear of them, as a very *Philosophical* sort of Persons. *Pliny* the Elder had mentioned them with great respect, as afterwards *Porphry* did also. But this concerned only their *Philosophy* of living. There was also among them, others who had written *Books* of *Philosophy*, not only *Aristobulus* the *Peripatetick* in the time of *Ptolomæus Philometor*; not only many others intimated, though not named by *Philo* the *Jew*, and *Josephus*, if

Nat. Hist. v. 17. de Abstin. iv. §. 11. &c.

Præf. ad
Antiq. in
fin. & Ant.
xx. 9. & ali-
bi sæpe.

if he ever lived to finish that work of the Sentiments of the *Jews*, so often promised by him, as I doubt, he did not. These, by Mysticizing the *Κοσμογονία* of *Moses* to a sense, not very distant from that received among the wisest *Philosophers*, and in a most elegant, rapturous, modish style (such was that of *Philo* particularly.) They gained so much further on the good opinion of the wise ones of that Age, as to have their Nation, which had formerly been despised as *Barbarous*, now to pass among the Nations which were Famous for Wisdom. And the rather because this way of Mysticizing the *Poets*, for the *Greeks*, into a *Systeme* of *Philosophy*, was already taken up by the *Stoicks*, and the other *Dogmatical Philosophers*, who were concerned for the defence of the received *Religions* against the *Atheists* and *Epicureans*, and *Scepticks*, who had taken great advantage from those *Fables*, for exposing them. Who had withall, been herein imitated by the *Aegyptians*, who had *Allegorized Isis* and *Osiris*, and all their own most Antient Histories. From whom the *Alexandrian Jews* seem willing to differ as little as was possible. Accordingly *Laertius*, who wrote not long after, takes them into that Number; and

Proœm. ad
vit. Philos.
p. 3. B.

and endeavoured, as he was able, to give some account of them, though on the ill Informations of *Clearchus* the *Peripatetick*. So also *Numenius* before him.

Numen. ap. Orig. c. Cell. 1. p. 13. & Euf. Pr. Ev. ix. 7.

§. XXXI. But there were also other things that contributed hereunto about the time of which I am speaking. One was the attestation of some *Oracles* received among the *Heathens* themselves, which also commended them for that very cause wherein they differed from the rest of Mankind. Such was that produced by *St. Justin Martyr*, not long after the time of *Philo*, as given by a *Heathen Deity* to a *Heathen Enquirer*: So he, *Ἐρωτῶν γὰρ τινος Παρνατικῆς* (ὡς αὐτοὶ φατέ) τὸ παρ' ὑμῶν χηρσῆσιον, τίνας σωθήσεται θεοσεβεῖς ἀνδράς μελλῶναι ποτε, ἔτω τὸ χηρσῆσιον εἰσηκέναι φατέ.

Parnatic. P. 12.

*Μῆνοι Χαλδαῖοι σοφίῳ δάχον, ἡδ' ἄρ' Ἑβραῖοι
Ἄυτοχρητὸν Ἀνακτα σέβας ὁμῶς Θεὸν αὐτὸν.*

God might possibly in this Case, make the *Devil* speak against his own Interest, as he did in the case of *Balaam*. To the same purpose we have other *Oracles* also owned by *Porphyry*, (very probably in his *Body of Philosophy Collected out of Oracles*,) whereof some might have been Antienter than the time of *Philo Byblinus*. I am not concerned to Dispute what real Credit these *Oracles* deserved, yet certainly

Ap. Euf. Pr. Ev. x. 10.

tainly they could not choose but have been very powerful recommendations to those *Philosophers* who did actually believe them *Divine*, and that is all for which I am concerned at present. To the same purpose, also I refer the advantageous Characters of *Abraham* and *Moses*, in the *Orphaicks* first mentioned in these first times of *Christianity*. And as *Orpheus* had among the *Heathens* the Reputation of a *Sacred* and *Inspired Person*, so his word must have been revered by them all, but particularly by the *Ægyptians*, and the Disciples of *Mercury*, because he was taken for a great promoter of their *Philosophy*. But there was yet a further reason that might peculiarly recommend him to the *Ægyptians*. That is, that he was, by some Traditions, received by Persons of great Authority among themselves, pretended to have been a *Sacred Person* to the Deity of *Heliopolis*. So *Chæremôn*, a

Ap. Joseph. cont. Appion. L. I. p. 1057. B. Manetho ap. Joseph. cont. Appion. L. I. p. 1053 A. & 1054. A. 1055. C.

Ἱερογλαμμάτων himself, makes *Joseph* and *Moses* also to have been *Ægyptian* Ἱερογλαμματοῖς, in the same Notion as the *Jews* also had their *Sacred Scribes*. And *Manetho* a *High Priest* and *Scribe*, also had delivered the same concerning *Moses*, that his *Ægyptian* name was *Osarsyph*, and that he was called so from *Osiris*. So I read

Ὀσίρεως

Ὀσίρεως rather than Ὀείριος the God of *Heliopolis* to whom he was *Priest*. The occasion of pretending this concerning *Joseph*, might possibly be his Marrying the Daughter of *Potipherah* Priest of *On*, which by the *Greek Interpreters* and *Demetrius*, was rendered Ἡλιόπολις. Concerning *Moses*, possibly it was his skill in all the *Learning of the Ægyptians*, that which was (1) *Sacred* as well as other sorts, which they might think he could never have got in such Perfection, if himself had not been a *Sacred Person*. It is no matter how far they were mistaken in believing so concerning him. Their actual believing so, is sufficient for my purpose, to make them entertain a great reverence for his *Philosophy*.

Demetrius
ap. Euseb.
Pr. Ev. IX.
21.

(1) Philo
Jud. de vit.
Mos. Lib. I.
p. 606. B.
Clem. Al.
Strom. I. p.
343. C. D.

§. XXXII. ACCORDINGLY there was about that time a Sect of the *Philosophers* themselves, that began to take notice of those *Mystical Expositions* of the *Law*, and to produce them with respect as *Authorities*, with honourable mention of *Moses* under the Titles of *Legislator* and *Prophet*. A name not unusual to them among the other *Oriental*s that were Famous for Wisdom, but particularly used among the *Phœnicians* and *Ægyptians*, and very properly belonging to him

as

L. III. adv. *as a Scribe or Priest of Heliopolis. Porphyry*
Christian. that inveterate Enemy of *Christianity*,
 ap. *Euseb.* takes notice of them, as they who had led
 Eccl. Hist. our *Christian Origen* the way in his *Allego-*
 vi. 19. *rical Expositions*. For such he reckons
Numenius, Cronius, Apollophanes, Longi-
nus, Moderatus, Nicomachus, Chæremon
and Cornutus. These did not only fol-
 low the way of *Allegorizing*, in turning
 the *Heathen Theogonyes* into *Mystical*
Senses, as appears in the work still ex-
 tant of *Cornutus*, on that Subject. That
 was not new. The *Stoicks* whom both
Cornutus and *Chæremon* followed, had
 begun that long before. They also fol-
 lowed the *Allegorizing Jews*, in allowing
 the Authority of *Moses*, in quoting him
 by the name of ὁ Προφήτης only, which I
 think is not usual with any but those *Alle-*
gorical Writers. Thus *Numenius*, with
 whom it was very ordinary. Thus *Lon-*
ginus in that only work which is extant
 of his, Περὶ τῶν ἑρμηνείων. And no doubt it would
 have appeared concerning more of them,
 if they had been extant. Nay thus even
 afterwards (when the rancours of the
Philosophers themselves against the Scri-
 ptures were grown higher) *Porphyry*
 himself, and *Chalcidius*, who is therefore
 by some less considering Persons mistaken
 for

Orig. c. Cels.
 1. p. 13. iv.
 p. 198. 199

De antr.
 Nymph.
 p. 256.

for a *Christian*, who yet pre-
 sumes to confute (*) his *Pro-*
phet where he dissents from
 him, though he do it indeed,
 as became the time he lived in,
 when the Empire was *Christian*,
 with civility and great respect.
 And the first of these which are
 mentioned by *Porphyry* will, in
 all likelihood, be earlier than
Philo Byblius. So will *Apollo-*
phanes, if he were the same who
 was meant by the Counterfeiter
 of the Works now extant un-
 der the name of *Dionysius the Areopagite*,
 who is there made to observe the *Eclipse*
 at our *Saviours* Death at *Heliopolis* in
Ægypt; and if that otherwise Learned
 Impostor have but observed the due *deco-*
rum of time. Much more, if he were the
Stoick, mentioned by *Athenæus*, but un-
 der the corrupt name of *Aphanes*, as con-
 temporary with *Eratoſthenes*, and Fellow-
 Disciple with him to *Ariston Chius*. And
 some of his Companions in this passage of
Porphyry were *Stoicks*, as *Cornutus* and
Chæremon. So will *Numenius*, if it were
 to him that *Apollonius Tyaneus* wrote that
 Discourse, whereof we have a Fragment
 in *Stobæus*. So will also *Cronius* for the
 same

(*) He reckons *Moses*
 among those who make
 matter to have a begin-
 ning. p. 372. Edit. *Meur-*
sii. But he afterwards
 joyns himself with those
 who make it *Eternal*.
 p. 376. 401. 409. 410.
 &c. Besides his saying
 concerning *Moses*, *di-*
vinâ, ut ferunt, Inspira-
tione vegetatus, plainly
 implies, that he did not
 believe him so inspired
 himself, but that he only
 delivered herein the
 Sense of others.

Athen. De-
 ipnos. vii.
 6. vid. *Me-*
nag. in *La-*
ert. L. vii.
 p. 186.

Eclog.
 Phyc.

De Antr.
Nymph.
p. 263.

To him
Persius
writes Sat.
V. Lib. xi.
Ep. 58.
Nat. Quæst.
L. vii. c. 5.
confer. O-
rig. c. Celf.
l. p. 45.

In Euseb.
Græc. p. 6.

same reason, whom *Porphyrus* assures us to have been *Ἐταῖρος*, a Friend and acquaintance of *Numenius*. So was *Annaeus Cornutus* certainly, and *Charemon* the *Stoick*, contemporary with *Martial* under *Domitian*, who must yet have been old at that time, if it were his Book *de Cometis* which was mentioned by *Seneca*. And he is certainly quoted by *Josephus*.

§. XXXIII. BUT there was also another occasion about this time, which made the *Jewish Κοσμογονία* more taken notice of. Which, though it seems indeed to have proceeded from this, yet recommended it farther, to many who knew nothing of the favourable esteem the forementioned *Philosophers* had for the *Jewish Philosophy* it self. That is, that it was about this time, taken into the pretended *Philosophy* of the *Ægyptian Hermes*. The name of *Hermes* had indeed been mentioned by many Authors before the coming of our Saviour. His *Pillars* also are said to have been consulted by *Manetho* for compiling his *History*. But for any *Philosophical Discourses* published under his name, such as the *Poemander* and *Asclepius* now extant, such as were many more now lost, but mentioned by the *Antients*, I believe there can be no Testimonies produced much

much Antienter than *Philo Byblius*, at least not as extant in the common *Greek Character* as well as *Tongue*. And yet they could hardly have been much later, considering that *St. Justin Martyr* quotes them about the time of *Antoninus Pius*, as also his Contemporary *Apuleius*, if the *Latin Translation* of *Asclepius* be his, considering withall, that (1)

Plutarch also mentions them, an Author undoubtedly equal, if not Antienter than *Philo Byblius*; that (2) *Ælian* does so who lived under *Hadrian*, Contemporary with *Philo*; considering also that before them, the *Ægyptian Hereticks*, the *Basilidians* especially, and the *Valentinians*, made use of many of his Notions. Now those *Hereticks* are generally by the consent of *Antiquity*, said to have risen about the time of *Hadrian*. But our most Learned Bishop of *Chester* * thinks them

Antienter, to whom I refer the Reader for satisfaction that desires it. However, the Author from whom they borrowed their *Heresies*, should in all reason, be some while Antienter than they. And from

(1) De Isid. & Osirid.
Ἐν τῇ τῷ Ἑρμῆ λεγο-
μέναις βίβλοις ἑστῶσι
καὶ ἑσφδαί, &c. p. 375. F.

(2) He quotes ὑφ' ἡγε-
νῶ Ἑρμῆ τῷ πρεσβυτά-
τῳ concerning the
marks of *Apis*, probably
out of those Two and
Forty *Mystical Books* of
Hermes, which contain-
ed the *Rituals* of the
Ægyptian Priests, men-
tioned by *Clemens Alex-
andrinus*, unless possibly
he did not mean a *Book*,
but a *Tradition* Father-
ed upon *Hermes*, like
those mentioned by
Manetho.

*Vind. Ign.

from him it is most likely that the *Valentinians* took their *Ogdoas*, and the *Basilidians* their *Magical Practices*, that I may not now descend to a more particular Parallel. Nor yet can I think, as the Learned *Casaubon* does, that any *Christian* (even of those *Hereticks*) counterfeited him. There are such other marks in him, that the Author was indeed a *Heathen*. He calls the *Sun* the greatest God of those that are in Heaven, to whom all the Heavenly Gods pay respect, as to their King and Potentate. And he elsewhere mentions the Gods appearing in the Stars. That he should call the *Sun* God, might indeed seem agreeable to the *Basilidian Hypothesis*, who made *Abraxas* theirs. But that he should allow all the Stars for Gods also, seems more than any *Christian* could grant. Yet even this Expression the *Hellenistical Jews* did not scruple. So *Philo* the Jew, speaking concerning the Creation of the Heavens, says, that it ought therefore to be created first, and of the purest part of Matter,

De Mund. Opif. p. 5. E. Διότι Θεὸν ἀφανῶν τε καὶ αἰδιότην ἐμελλεν οἰκτῆσαι ἱερῶτα τῶν. These αἰδινοὶ θεοὶ were no doubt the Stars. However there were many more things extant then, in the time of *Philo Byblius*, which did undeniably

ably prove the Author to have been a *Heathen*. Such were those Books mentioned by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, where in all the whole Order of the *Aegyptian* Worship was particularly prescribed, by which their Idolatrous *Priests* in those times were guided. Strom. vi. p. 633.

§. XXXIV. YET though the Author of these Counterfeited works, pretending to the name of *Hermes* were a *Heathen*, I must withall grant, that the great Person now mentioned, had an occasion for mistaking him for a *Christian*, from those frequent allusions to the *Old Testament* Scriptures, which he had observed in him. But I have already shewn another way how these *Allusions*, not express *Quotations*, might have been used by a *Heathen* of that Age. That is, that the Counterfeiter of them, might have been one of that Set of *Philosophers*, who had, as has been shewn, taken in the *Jewish Philosophy* into theirs, from the Writings of *Philo* and such others as had recommended it to them, by their *Mystical Expositions* of it. Accordingly, their *Quotations* of the *Scriptures* themselves, are generally at the *Second hand*, as they found them already produced by such Writers as they dealt with, not mentioning, or

F 2 but

but very rarely, either *Book* or *Author*, as in all likelihood they would, if they had taken them immediately from the *Originals*. And this Party was more likely to propagate among the *Ægyptians*, (such as these undoubtedly were who Forged the Works of *Hermes*,) because the *Alexandrian Jews* were most Famous both for *Numbers* and *Learning*, above any of their Nation in any other Colony; had multitudes of their *Philosophical Essenes*, and a flourishing *Temple* among them to the days of *Vespasian*; and did, no doubt, suit their notions as near, as Truth would give them leave, to the received Doctrines of the *Ægyptians*, which were very plausible recommendations to them. And when it had thus got into the *Hermetical Philosophy*, by this means it was unawares insinuated into those who were most averse either to the *Jewish* or the *Christian* Religion, who yet had a great Veneration for the *Philosophy*, as was pretended, of the Antient and Deified *Hermes*. *Longinus* was one of them, who yet wrote against the *Christians*. And *Porphyry* another, who yet was one of the greatest Adversaries, perhaps, that the *Christians* ever had. And this was the more likely to prevail among them, when

Ap. Euseb.
Pr. Ev. xv.
20.

when *Moses* himself was taken for one of their own *Priests*, and that of *Heliopolis*, where those very *Pillars* are pretended to have been, from whence the Doctrine of *Mercury* was pretended to have been Collected, the custody of which must, by their customs, been properly his Province as a *Priest*. So that on this account, they might presume his Doctrine to have been the same with that of *Mercury*. But how much more might they presume it, if they took his Person to have been the same also? And some of them were of that opinion, if we may believe *Artapanus*. This I take to be a more likely account, how *Scripture Notions* got among the *Philosophers*, than the common mistaken passage concerning *Ammonius* and the *ισαδ διαδοχη*. I am sure it agrees much better both with *Historical Truth* and *Experiments* than the other, however it has had the Fortune to take among Learned men.

Artap. ap.
Euseb. Pr. Ev.
ix. 27.

§. XXXV. To return therefore to *Philo Byblius*, this I take to be the most likely design of his forging the whole History of his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. He was, no doubt, as a *Phœnician*, zealously concerned for the honour of his Country. Nay his concernment for his own City

Ἐπὶ τῇ τοῖς
 ὁ Κρόντος
 τεῖχος πει-
 εῖσιν αὐτῶν
 οἰκῆσιν, καὶ
 παρῶν τῶν
 πόλιν καὶ τῶν
 ὁ πρὸ Φοι-
 νίκης Βύ-
 βλον. ap.
 Euseb. Pr.
 Ev. l. 10. p.
 37. A. and
 from him
 Stephanus.
 Nat. Hist.
 v. 20.

Byblos appears, in that he makes his fictitious Author pretend that it was the *First City* in *Phœnicia*. Had it been so, it is strange, it should never have been mentioned in the *Scriptures* before the times of the Prophets, where notwithstanding so many other *Phœnician* Cities are so frequently mentioned. The גבלי in *Jo-sua* seems to be rather from *Gabala* a City of *Phœnicia*, distinct from *Byblos*, *Ptolomy* and *Gamala* in *Pliny*. This very thing is a shrewd suspicion that *Sanchoniathon* was to say nothing but what *Philo Byblius* would have him, that though we have seen him so full of a partial *design* for the honour of his Country; and though we have seen him guilty of so many *instances* of notorious *dissimulation* in that regard; and though this pretence concerning *Byblos*, appears, from the *Scripture*-description of *Phœnicia*, to have been as groundless a *fiction* as any he had been guilty of: Yet he should yield to the Interest of *Philo*, and make his *Byblos* a more Antient City even than his own beloved *Berytus*, when he might with as much ground have preferred his own City before it. The name of *Berytus* does certainly better resemble a *Phœnician* Original than that of *Byblos*. *Philo* therefore

being

being thus concerned; and being, by his concernment, prompted to say many things both new and false, and which could not be made appear from any Monuments as yet produced; thought himself therefore obliged to pretend some new means of *Information* for his pretended *Sanchoniathon*, in such matters as he was to deliver without any known Authority of extant Authors. And because he knew the *Tyrian Records* and *Inscriptions* had been searched and published before; he therefore makes his *Sanchoniathon* to enquire also into the *Records* and *Inscriptions* of the other particular Cities. This seems to have been his Artifice to recommend what he had to say in favour of his own City, in opposition to the other Cities of *Phœnicia*, or in favour of his Country, in opposition to such Countries as had not Authority of their own *Records* to oppose against him.

§. XXXVI. BUT these were not the only Adversaries against whom his Ambition had engaged him in this Work. He seems also in this very Work to have had a particular design upon the *Jews*. One whole *Book* of this work seems to have related to them in particular. For that very same passage concerning *Abraham's*

Ἐκ τῶν καὶ
 πόλιν ὁ
 ποταμὸς
 τῶν, ὅτι
 Porphy. ap.
 Euseb. Pr.
 Ev. l. 9. p.
 31. B.

Pr. Ev. l. 10. Sacrificing *Isaac*, which *Eusebius* relates
 P. 40. B. from the work of *Philo* Περὶ Ἰσραήλ that
 Pr. Ev. iv. he produces elsewhere from the *First*
 16. P. 156. Book of his *Phœnician* History. By this
 D. it should seem, both that the proper Title of

(*) Thus it appears from the abrupt beginnings of many of *Philo's* Works, that they were designed to continue others, though of different Titles. So St. *Luke's* Πρῶτον Ἄδων was his Gospel, his Second is Περὶ Ζηζου καὶ Ἀποστόλων, written, no doubt at the same time, and intended to continue the same History where his Gospel left it. So *Josephus* after his *Antiquities*, immediately subjoyned his *Life*, (as has already been observed by the most Learned Dr. *Isaac Vossius*) and after his *Life* his Books against *Appion*, yet so as that his *Life* and his Two Books against *Appion* kept their distinct Titles, none ever mentioning any more than Twenty Books of his *Antiquities*, excepting *Cassiodore*, who reckons Two and twenty, *Div. Lect. c. 17*. No doubt the Two odd Books were those against *Appion*. So that it seems his *Life*, though added as an Appendix to his Twentieth Book, yet did not increase the Number. So *Theophilus Antiochenus's* Third

the *First* Book was concerning the *Jews*, (as many (*) Instances might have been given of such proper Titles of Parts of larger Works in those times,) and that this Book distinct from *Philo's* Preface, was reckoned as the *First* Book, which would again confirm what I said before to reconcile *Eusebius*, who reckons Nine Books of this *Phœnician* History with *Porphyry*, who reckons only Eight, that this *First* Book was taken into the Number of the whole Work by *Eusebius*, but left out by *Porphyry*, because it had a distinct Title by it self. Unless possibly the same passage in the *First* Book of the *Phœnician* History, were quoted by *Philo* in that other work of

of his concerning the *Jews*, for I confess there is some difficulty in making them the same. However, for the present, supposing that he designed one Book principally to give an account of *Jewish* Affairs; and that he had withall, a farther design of arrogating the principal ornaments of their Nation to his own, (of which his other Work is alone sufficient to render him suspicious, though he had no particular Book of this that bore such a Title) and that he knew that an account from *Phœnician* Records here, would not be taken for sufficient to confront their own so much better, and more Authentick Testimonies concerning themselves, especially when confirmed with such a concurrence of Testimonies of other Nations, *Phœnicians* as well as others, as he had seen produced by *Josephus*:

Book *Ad Autolyc.* was not Antiently called the Third Book as it is now, but by a proper Title, *Liber de Temporibus ad Autolyc.* as appears from *Lactantius, Div. Inst. l. 23.* and it plainly begins with a new address, as if designing a new Argument. So *Clement Alexandrinus's* *Protreptick, Pædagogus* and *Stromateis* carry on the same design. So *Eusebius's* Book *De Martyribus Palæstinæ* plainly connects with the end of the Eighth Book of his *Ecclesiastical History*, yet so as not to disturb the account of his Ten Books of that whole work. So the same *Eusebius's* Three Books against *Marcellus Ancyranus*, and Two *De Ecclesiasticâ Theologiâ* belong plainly to the same work. So the Seven Books of *Lactantius* of *Divine Institutions*, have every one of them distinct Titles. But the instance of the Books of *Lucifer Calaritanus* is most remarkable. They were all designed as parts of the same work, written continuedly, and intended to be presented at the same time to the Emperour *Constantius*. Yet no continuation of any one number of Books, or Title. There are Two in defence of *Athanasius*, one *De Regibus Apostaticis*, another *De non conveniendo cum Hæreticis*, another *De non*

There-

parcendo in Deum delinquentibus, and lastly, one De eo quod moriendum sit pro Dei filio. I have been the more particular in these instances, because as the Observations are useful, so I have not found them commonly taken notice of.

Therefore it may be, he thought it fit his *Sanchoniathon* should live in the time of *Abibalus* the Father of that *Hiram*, whose time was the highest Period of any *Phœnician* Testimo-

nies, yet produced concerning *Jewish* Affairs.

§. XXXVII. This time he makes either equal, or a little before the Destruction of *Troy*, when he makes his Author equal to *Semiramis*, who was, as he tells us, either equal, or a little before that War. Which yet is not so to be understood, as if he had fixed this time by the Age of *Semiramis*. No, he would have his *Abibalus* equal with her, whose Husband *Ninus* was taken, as I said, for the utmost Period of *Heathen* History. But the fixation of this time, was from the time of *Abibalus*, and that *Abibalus* no other than the Father of *Hiram*. His time indeed, according to the account that had already been given from the *Tyrian* Records by *Menander Ephesus*, will agree with what is said concerning the War of *Troy*. For from the Twelfth of *Hiram*, concurrent with the Fourth of *Solomon* wherein the Temple was begun, to the building of *Carthage*

Carthage by *Dido* are reckoned One Hundred forty three years and Eight Months, by *Josephus* from *Menander*. If therefore *Dido* received *Aeneas* coming from *Troy*, as *Virgil* and his Authors will have it (as undoubtedly so exact a Man as he had Authors for what he said, and there is nothing so certainly agreed among Authors concerning the building either of *Carthage* or *Rome* to contradict it) *Sanchoniathon* must then have been so much and more (as contemporary, not with *Hiram*, but *Abibalus*) before the War of *Troy*, as *Porphry* himself does expressly place him.

Which there would yet have been more pretence for with them who had followed the account of *Appian*, who makes the very building of *Carthage* to have been Fifty years Elder than the Destruction of *Troy*. I doubt not but it was a great mistake, but I am only concerned to shew what account, right or wrong, they might have followed who made him Elder than the War of *Troy*. But if this same number of One hundred forty three years and Eight Months was the distance between the War

Joseph. c. Appian. L. 1. p. 1042. B. 1043. F. 8c apud Euf. Pr. Ev. X. 13. From whom Theophilus Antiochenus's account of that same Number from the same Authority is to be corrected L. iii. ad Autolyc. cxliii. for cxxxiv. And Lactantius who usually followed Theophilus in his Chronology has cxi. neglecting the smaller number. Div. Inst. iv. 8.

ΟΙ δὲ τέτων χρόνοι καὶ πρὸ τῆς Τρωϊκῆς πίπτει χρόνων. Porph. ap. Euf. Pr. Ev. l. 9. p. 31. D.

Appian. Punic. init.

or

Chron. L.ii of *Troy* and the building of *Carthage*, as
 Num. Euseb. Eusebius does conceive; then it will fol-
 971. low that he was about the time of that
War. And to this exactly agrees the ac-
 Menander count of the same Menander and *Lotus*,
 & *Lotus* ap. (the Publisher and Translator of *Mochus*,
 Cl. Alex. *Hypsicrates* and *Theodotus*) who make
 Strom. I. *Menelaus* put in at *Phœnicia* in his return
 P. 326. from *Troy* in the time of *Hiram*. This
 I take to be the true account of this doubt-
 ful dis-junction concerning this time, be-
 cause it is so very agreeable with the then
 extant *Phœnician* Authors. As for the
 making *Sanchoniathon* equal with *Semira-
 mis*, as it was indeed done very unskil-
 fully; so it seems (as I said) to have been
 with a design to put him beyond all possi-
 bility of conviction by different Authors,
 making him hereby so far *superior* in time
 to any *Records* that might pretend to ri-
 val him, as that he must have been equal
 to the utmost Period of time, that they
 pretended with any confidence to give
 any account of.

§. XXXVIII. AND having placed him
 thus high, he was in course obliged to de-
 rive his *Means of Information* yet higher.
 But being to give an account of *Jewish*
Affairs, upon the Credit (as I said) of
Jewish Testimonies, yet very different
 from

from those which were owned and re-
 ceived among the *Jews* themselves; he
 was therefore obliged to bethink himself
 of some *Jewish* Name to Father his Re-
 cords upon, of whose *Writings* the *Jews*
 themselves had never heard. And the
 reasons, why he was to make him a *Priest*,
 might be of two sorts: That he might
 hereby recommend his Authors *Credit*,
 because those most Antient accounts of
 things were generally, as we have seen, de-
 rived from *Sacred Inscriptions* in *Temples*,
 pretended also to have been written either
 in *Hieroglyphicks*, or *Sacred Characters*,
 to which as the *Priests* were supposed to
 have the easiest access, so they were also,
 by those *Mystical Instructions* which they
 were obliged to know as *Priests*, best
 qualified for understanding them: And
 that he might also give an account why
 such unheard-of *Writings* might have been
 so long concealed from *Vulgar* knowledg,
 because being *Sacred*, and written by a
Sacred Person, they might have been kept
 within the *Adyta*, only among the *Priests*,
 which might also give an account how
 they might afterwards miscarry, before
 the pretended *Sanchoniathon* was to ap-
 pear to quote them, though they might
 have been supposed really extant when
 he

he was to *Collect* his Observations from them. Accordingly, whoever of the *Philosophers*, made it his business to enquire into the *Monuments* of any place, whether *Historical*, or *Philosophical*, made his addressees to the *Priests* of the place, whose *Antiquities* he was desirous to learn. So *Pythagoras* in *Phœnicia* to the *Prophets* the Posterity of *Mochus*, in *Ægypt* to the *Heliopolitane*, *Memphitane* and *Diospolitane Priests*, particularly to *Oennuphis* or *Psenuphis*, and perhaps *Sonchis*; *Solon* and *Lycurgus*, but particularly *Solon*, to the same *Priests* now mentioned; *Endoxus* to *Chonuphis*, and *Plato* to *Sechnuphis*. And for *Plato*, on occasion of his *Story* of the Island *Atlantis*, and the *Exploits* of his own Country-men the *Athenians* against them, for which he was beholden, not to any *Athenian Monuments*, but only to those pretended to by the *Ægyptian Saitane Priests*: So he thought himself concerned, as well as he could, to defend their *Credit*, and to do it by these degrees. First, though this was only a matter of *Secular History*, yet for the better recommendation of it, he refers, not to *Secular*, but *Sacred Records*. Next he assigns these *Sacred Writings*, as was undoubtedly most proper, to the custody

Jamblich.
de vit. Py-
thagor. Por-
phy. vit. Py-
thag. Plu-
tarch. Solon
& de Isid.
& Osirid.
Clem. Al.
Strom. I.
p. 303.

In Tim. init.

custody of the *Priests*. Then he insinuates a Recommendation of the *Credit* of their *Priests*, beyond any of other places that might be opposed to them, from the particular conveniences they enjoyed, above others, for adding themselves wholly to the employment of their own Profession, and their unmixedness with the *Prophane Vulgar*. Accordingly they who, before *Sanchoniathon*, pretended to Publish their own Records, were generally *Priests*. So was *Berosus* and *Manetho*, and *Chæremon*. And *Manetho* assumes the Title in the very *Dedication* of his Work, as if it were purposely to add the greater credit to his performance. And though the *Jews* pretended to no such *Sacred Pillars* or *Inscriptions*; nor ever kept their *Sacred Books* so reserved from the *Vulgar*, either in *Sacred* unknown *Characters*, or by laying them up in the *Adyta*; yet because it was fashionable, they also insisted on the same way of defending their own *Records* against the *Heathens* who contradicted them. So *Josephus* also reasons. He also derives his *Information* from the *Sacred Records* of his own *Nation*. He makes the preserving these *Records* the peculiar Province of their *Priests*. He insists on the same *Qualifications*

Ap. Euseb.
Chr. Gr.
p. 6.

Cont. Appi-
on. L. I.
p. 1036.

lifications of their *Priests*, which *Plato* had used before him, their *Separation* from *Secular* Employments, and their *unmixedness* with *Vulgar Affinities*. And as often as he has occasion to vindicate his own *Credit*, either against *Justus Tiberiensis*, or the then *Gentile* Authors who had given other accounts of the *Jewish War*, than he had done, though this were not a Subject wherein he could pretend any *Sacred Records*, yet still he insists on this Topick of his being a *Priest* for Vindicating his own *Historical Credit* against them. So that from hence the Learned *Bochart* might have seen a very useful reason why *Sanchoniathon*, when he makes his *Hierom-baal* not only a *Jew*, but a *Priest*, should also understand the name *Priest* in the *Sacred* and *Popular* signification.

§. XXXIX. AND having thus made him a *Jew* and a *Priest*, it followed farther, that he was to be made a *Priest* of the *God* of the *Jews*. But *Jao* (which is the same name with *Jevo*, and is read for it in this same passage of *Porphyry* concerning *Sanchoniathon*, as we have it in *Theodoret*) is the name by which the *God* of the *Jews* was known among the *Heathens*, even before the time of *Philo Byblinus*. *Diodorus Siculus* in the time of *Augustus*, had expressly

expressly made *Jao* to be the *God* from whom *Moses*, as he would have it believed, pretended to have received his *Laws*. And it may also hence be conjectured why he pitched on *Gideon* rather than any other on whom he was to Father his Forgeries. He designedly chooses to call him by his *Sur-name* of *Hierom-baal*, rather than his *Original* name of *Gideon*, possibly because it was the Fashion, as on other occasions, so on the undertaking the office of a *Priest*, for those *Orientals*, to change their names, as one Ceremony of their *Consecration*. Thus *Joseph*, whom they made a *‘Iecozapmuard’s*, had the *Aegyptian* name given him of *Psonthom-phanech* in the Scripture, but *Peteseph* in *Chæremôn*; *Moses* that of *Osarsiph* in *Manetho*, *Tisithen* in *Chæremôn*, *Joachim*, but especially *Melchi* with the *Mystæ* in *Clemens Alexandrinus*. And this might also have been the reason why *Nebuchadnezzar* changed the names of *Daniël* and the *Three Children* when he had given them up to the Institution of the *Chaldeans* who were reputed *Sacred* among them. And upon this account, as I said, he might the

G

rather

Chæremôn ap. Joseph. c. Appion. L. i. p. 1057. B.

Osarsiph ap. Maneth. Jos. c. Appion. L. i. p. 1054. A. Tisithen ap. Chæremôn. Joseph. ib. p. 1057. B.

Joachim. & Melchi after his Assumption into Heaven. Clem. Alexandr. Strom. i. p. 343. C.

Antiq. xvi. II. p. 563. E. cont. Ap- pion. L. i. p. 1038. A.

Theodoret. Therap. ii.

Bibliothec. L. ii.

rather make a *Priest* of *Gideon*, because there is none of the *Judges* but he that has any more than one name given him in the Scripture. But insisting on his Authority as a *Priest*, he might think it more convenient to call him by his *Mystical name*, rather than by that by which he was commonly known. Besides who knows but he might purposely pitch upon the name *Ιεουβααλ* that the very name might seem to the *Greeks*, (for whom he designed his pretended Translation,) to imply his being a *Ιεγδς*? There are innumerable examples of the like absurd Etymologies of words of other Tongues, especially among *Mystical Writers* of all sorts, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, from *Greek Originals*, which yet generally prevailed. How much more easie was it for him to impose on them in a Tongue so little understood by them as the *Hebrew* or *Punic*? They themselves took a Liberty of doing it, when they had a mind to prove their own *Fictions* from such ignorant

Etymologies. Thus *Lysimachus* proved that the *Jews* had built their City *Hierusalem*, with the *Sacrilegious* spoils of all other *Temples* and *Altars* they met with in their way from the

Lysimach. ap. Joseph. cont. Appion. L. I. p. 1058. G. So Eupolemus derives Hierosolyma quasi Ιερον Σολομων, ap. Euf. Pr. Ev. ix.

Etymology of Hierosolyma quasi Ιερουσαι. Who knows also but he might himself gather a thing he was so willing should prove true from the very *Hebrew* name of *Gideon*? It may be he might think it to have some affinity with the *גיד* rendered by the LXXII. *επασιδ* and *τετατο-σκόποι*, which none can doubt to have been proper to the Superstitious *Priest-hoods* of those times, of which kind it is most likely this Heathen would make that of *Gideons*. As for the Letter *G*, where it stands for *γ*, there it is frequently neglected, and even where it stands for *γ*, as it does here, yet it is easily changed for another Letter of the same *Organ*, as *ι* is. But, if we must needs take in the *γ*, yet he might possibly collect the same from *גד* the root of *גדען*. If it signifie to *destroy*, we know the *Sacrifices* were *Symbols* of *destruction*, either as acknowledged due for past crimes, or as imprecated in case of any new violation of *Faith* for the future, as in those which were used in the making of *Covenants*. Accordingly the word *διστομεν* is used for *destruction*, no doubt in allusion to the *εντομια* which were cut into *two pieces* for the *Covenanters* to pass through. But if it signifie to divide, that is yet most properly the *Priests*

Vid. Selden de Diis Syr. Syntagm. I. c. 2. & Bux- torf.

St. Matth. xxiv. 51

Office, whence the Notion of *ἑρδιστομεῖν* * *ἀόρον* in the Apostle, applyed to *Sacrifices* Gen. iv. 7. in the LXXII. Whether by dividing, we understand the dividing the whole for the Parties to pass through, or the dividing the back (whence the Notion of *τετραχλισμένα* in the Apostle) to look into the Entrails, or the dividing the Fat to Gods part to be burnt, not reserving it to themselves, of which the famous Story of *Prometheus* among the Heathens, which is supposed most properly to belong to the Case of *Cain*.

§. XL. It was also further usual in those Precedents, whom our pretended Author seems to emulate in Forging this work, to begin their *Antiquities* with a Philosophical *κοσμογονία*. So had *Moses*, whose Translation by the LXXII. very probably first set the rest upon it. So had *Berosus*, as appears by what we have from *Alexander Polyhistor* out of his First Book. So *Manetho's* in his Book *Sothis*, the same it should seem with his *ἱερὸν βιβλίου*, in which was contained his *Theologia*, another name of the Mystical accounts of those First Originals, and it may be the same with the *φυσιολογικὰ* mentioned by *Suidas*, and seems to have been also the beginning of his History.

Ap. Hesiod.
Theogon.

In Euseb.
Gr. p. 6.
In Euseb.
Gr. p. 6. &
de Pr. Ev.
II. p. 44. C.

Voce Μα-
ταιστων.

History. Thus therefore *Philo* also thought it convenient to begin his *Sanchoniathon* with a Philosophical, but Mystical account of the beginning of the World. And here also the *Ægyptian* Notions had generally obtained. I have shewn how *Berosus* and the *Phœnicians* came to pretend to them. I have also shewn how the Doctrine even of *Moses* came to be taken into them. But it seems to have been the custom of the *Ægyptians*, to father all their Arts and Monuments, and Sacred Constitutions on *Hermes*. Thence so many thousand Books ascribed to him in *Jamblichus*. Nor was it only taken up by them. It was usual in those times to father the Monuments of a Sect on the first Author of it. Thus the *Golden Verses*, and other works among the *Pythagoreans* ascribed to *Pythagoras*, who yet is said to have written (*) nothing, and that with a design that his Disciples might not read, but live according to his Injunctions. Thus *Plato's* Discourses fathered on *Socrates* who yet disowned (*) his being the Author of many things there attributed to him. Thus (*) *Zoroastres's* works kept secret a-

De Myst.
Ægypt. &
chald.

* Joseph. c. Appion. L. I.
1046. E. Lucian de laps.
in salut. S. Hieronym. adv.
Rufin. Plutarch. de Fort.
Alexand. L. I. p. 328. A.
Porphy. vit. Pythag. p.
208. Claudian. Mam. de
Stat. Anim. L. II. c. 3.
(*) Laert. L. III. Platon.
p. 78. B. The same Athe-
neus says concerning
Gorgias and Phædon De-
ipnos. L. XI. c. 15. p. 505.
2. 507. B. (*) Clem. Al.
Str. I. p. 304. D.

mong the Disciples of *Prodicus*, a shrewd suspicion of their being Forged by them. And this modish way of those times was, in all likelihood, the occasion of so many Supposititious works Forged by the Primitive Hereticks under the name of the *Apostles*. So also (*) *Enoch* being owned by the *Babylonians* for the Author of *Judicial Astrology*, and other Arts and Sciences, being pretended to have been revealed to his Son *Mathuselah* by an *Angel*, was in all likelihood the occasion of Forging the Prophecy of *Enoch*, and those Discoveries pretended in it by the *Ἐγγύροισι*, though it also appears that the Books of *Mercury* favoured the same accounts of the fall of those Angels, because the *Babylonians* and *Ægyptians* both pretended to the same Traditions at *Heliopolis*. But in no sort of Writing was this more frequent than in their (1) *Dialogues*, which was the Form generally observed in these pretended works of *Mercury*. And I cannot tell, but these same Traditions of the *Heliopolitane* were so far countenanced by the *Jews* themselves, as their own Revealed Religion would give leave. The account of *Moses's* Expedition into *Æthiopia*, and several other things much for his advantage, was taken by

(*) *Eupolemi*. ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. L. ix.

Fragm. ap. *Stob.* Eclog. Phys. & *Lactant.* Div. Inst. ii. 15, 16.

(1) Expressly owned by *Cicero* Ep. ad *Varron.* ante *Quaest.* Academ. & *Macrobi.* Saturnal. l. i. c. i.

by *Artapanus* from the *Heliopolitane*, and greedily followed by *Josephus*, which shews no ill understanding among them. So also does the *Jews* choosing that place above all others, to build their *Ægyptian* Temple of *Onias*, I mean at the *Heliopolitane* *Leontopolis* in contradistinction to *Leontopolis*, that was the head of a distinct *νομός*. Nor is there any heed to be taken of the *Rabbins* who place it in *Alexandria*, though I believe, by *Alexandria* they mean the whole *Ægyptian* Colony of *Jews*, in opposition to their Colonies in other Countries.

Artapan. apud *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. ix. 27. p. 432. D. *Joseph.* Ant. ii. 5.

Joseph. Ant. xii. 15. xiii. 6. xx. 8. Bell. Jud. vii. 30.

Vid. *Selden* de Success. in Pontif. Hebr. L. ii. c. 8.

XLI. THIS *Ægyptian* Philosophy therefore, being that which was ingredient in most of the received *κοσμογονίαι*, at least being pretended and conceived to be so, how different soever the accounts were, which were pretended from that same Original; therefore *Philo Byblius* also thought it fit to take it into his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. And because he had found it Fathered on Authors who so little agreed concerning the Particulars of it, where it was to be had, and who must therefore some of them be certainly mistaken; it was therefore necessary to pretend

tend to some very certain means of *Information*. Accordingly he also pretends to the *Writings*, not the Pillars of *Taautus* or *Mercury*. Which, by the way, makes it suspicious that he took his Informations from the Books as Published from the *Helipolitane* Pillars, seeing he does not himself, so much as pretend to the Original Pillars themselves; and yet to secure his credit from being only at the *Second hand*, he pretends that *Mercury* caused them to be written Originally, not in Pillars, but in Books. But because so many before him who had pretended to those same *Writings*, had yet mistaken in *Interpreting* them; he therefore contrives a likely account how they might have a likely occasion of such mistakes, and yet himself be free from the suspicion of the like *Errors*. He pretends therefore that the first *Writings* of *Mercury*, had extricated the *Philosophical* accounts of the first *Originals* of things, from the *Mythological* Arts of concealment, wherein *Antiquity* had involved them; and that it was some while after, but yet before any communication with the *Greeks*, that the Priests had again involved them. Which yet being done before *Orpheus's* time, by whose means they came to the *Greeks*, was a plain occasion

occasion how the *Greek Writers*, who followed those latter accounts darkened purposely by the Priests, might be mistaken. Because they had nothing to inform them but these designedly obscure *Allegories*, which were both capable of many senses in themselves; and if any certain sense had been preserved, yet it had not been easily discoverable by the *Greeks* without the Priests, who, as I said, were not forward to communicate any thing of that nature to *Strangers*.

§. XLII. AND by the same means he had also provided an account how the *Ægyptians* themselves might be mistaken concerning their own Philosophy. For those Priests, who first involved them, are said to have delivered them down thus obscured, both to their own *Successors*, καὶ τοῖς ἐπιστάτοις, that is, to such as were initiated in their *Mysteries*, as I believe *Vigerus* has rightly rendered it. It seems then, that they must not have been supposed to have cleared them, even to such as were initiated, which sure they would have done, if themselves had preserved any certain Tradition concerning them. Accordingly they are supposed to have continued under this obscurity, till (after many Generations from *Taautus*,)

Ap. Euseb.
Pr. Ev. i. 10.
p. 39. C.

Ib. p. 40. B.

Summa-

Surmubelus and *Thuro* are said to have again unriddled them. So I understand those words of *Philo Byblius*; ἀλληγρείας ἐπισκασμῶν ὃ Θεολογίαν ἐφώτισαν. For this seems to have been the Notion of that Sacred term φωτισμός, as it is used in the counterfeit Writings of *Mercury*, (whom this Author follows) and the Pen-men of the *New-Testament*, and other such Writers of that Age, for the *Revelation of Mysteries*. I suppose from that Literal δαδελία and φωτισμός, and withdrawing of the *Vail* before the Shrine of the Image by the ἱεροφάντης, which were in the ordinary course of *Initiation* to be used to those who were brought into the dark *Adyta*, and initiated in the higher sort of *Initiation* called Ἐπιπεία. These therefore I suspect to have been pretended for the Authors of the Ἀπόκρυφα Ἀμμωνίων γράμματα, to which this Author pretended, as has already been observed. Wherein if I be not mistaken, it will then be further suspicious, that these Authors themselves did not so discover them as to make them common to the prophane *Vulgar*, but only so as to retrieve the *Traditions* of the *Priests*, which had probably, by that time, quite miscarried, after they had been so long reserved in their *Breſts*, and intrusted only
to

to *Oral-Tradition*. For, if these discoveries had been designed for the *Vulgar*, the *Writings* which contained them, would not have been styled Ἀπόκρυφα, (the proper term for *Mystical Writings*) nor confined to the Ἀδύτα, and by that means rendered inaccessible to *uninitiated Persons*, as they are supposed to have been. Besides that, by the present extant Epistle of *Ammon*, it appears that the *Ammonians* must not have been for divulging their *Mysteries*.

§. XLIII. AND in giving this account how all that had before him, written on this Subject, might have been mistaken, he at the same time secured his own Authority from the like Exceptions. For having pretended before, that *Taantus* had written his Books clear from those *Mythologies* and *Allegories* wherein they had been involved by the *Priests*, and were afterwards again involved till they were a second time unriddled by *Surmubelus* and *Thuro*; and having made his *Sanchoniathon* derive his Information immediately, both from *Taantus*'s own Books, and from the Books of those *Expositors*, who afterwards retrieved his way of speaking clearly without *Allegories*: He had hereby secured himself of two things
of

of great moment for recommending his *Credit*. One was, that his *Informations* were derived from clear and unobscured *Originals*, not from *Allegorical* and *Second-hand* accounts, from them who had no mind to be understood by those to whom they communicated their *Mysteries*. Another was that, even for those *Originals* themselves, he did not depend on a single Authority. The consent of the *Writings* of *Mercury*, with those of the *Ammonians*, were to be mutual attestations of the *Sincerity* of each, (at least would be pleaded as such by him) that neither the *Original Writings* of *Taautus*, nor those retrievements from the *Ammonians*, might seem suspicious of being the *Fictions* of those who *first* produced them. For having pretended them to be from distant *Writers*, and distant places, and *Sacred inaccessible Records*; it would be pretended that there could not have been that *Communication* between them, as to make them able to agree in *Forgeries*. Yet was not this excluding of *Allegories* to be understood so, as if he had avoided all *Fables*; but particularly with respect to the *Stoical* way, whether by them derived to the later *Ægyptians*, or borrowed from them. That was to *Allegorize*

gorize their first *Histories* into a *Κοσμογραφία*, a *Systeme of Natural Philosophy*, to make *Jupiter* signifie the *Æther*, *Juno* the *Air*, *Vesta* the *Earth*, *Neptune* the *Sea*, &c. and so to *Allegorize* the *History* of the *Actions* of those *Persons* into a *History of Nature*; as if indeed there had never been such *Actions* or *Persons*, but only that the several *Elements* of *Nature* had been *Mystically* represented by such *Names*, and the *Phænomena* of *Nature* had, by a *Poetical Prosopopæia*, been turned into a *Romance*. That these were indeed the *Allegories* designed by *Philo Byblius*, appears by these words of his: 'Αλλ' οἱ μὲν νεώτατοι τῶν ἱερολόγων, *Philo Bybli.*
τὰ μὲν γένετα πλάσματα ὧς ἀρχῆς ἀπεπέμψαντο, *ap. Euf. Pr.*
ἁλληγορίας καὶ μύθους ἐπινοήσαντες, καὶ τοῖς κοσμικοῖς *Ev. l. 9.*
παθήμασι συγγένειαν πλασάμενοι, μυστήρια κατέστησαν,
καὶ πολλὰ αὐτοῖς ἐπῆγον τύπον ὡς μὴ ῥαδίως τινα συνω-
ρεῖν τὰ κατ' ἀλήθειαν γινόμενα. And again,
ἁλληγορήσας, τοῖς τε φυσικοῖς καὶ κοσμικοῖς πάθεσιν *Ap. Euseb.*
ἀναμίξας, &c. And what with graceful *Pr. Ev. L.*
mixtures of *Poetical fancy*, in the most *10. p. 39. C.*
Antient Writers of their *First Originals*,
who were generally *Poets*; what with
that delight of the *Antients* in *Parables*,
and in vesting their *Parables* with *Historical* and likely *Circumstances*; what with
that ordinary Method of these *Mystical Writers*, who usually made way for their
Allegories,

Allegories by catching at little occasions of confuting the *Historical Truth* of what they designed to *Allegorize* (wherein we see them imitated by *Philo*, *Origen*, and the other *Antients* who first began to practice this way with the *Scriptures*) I say with all these wayes, they made it indeed seem likely, if not concerning all that was said of those *Persons*, yet concerning many of them, that they were not so much as designed for *Historical Truths*, but only for *Allegorical Representation*. Yet these not being distinguishable from their designed *Histories*, at least not in later times after the obliteration of the *Original Traditions*; and being withall delivered on the same *Authority* which delivered the designed *Histories*; must therefore render all their *Histories* liable to just *Suspicion*.

§. XLIV. Nor does it seem to have been the way of *Allegorizing* only, that *Philo* found fault with in the *Greek Writers*, and that uncertainty of their *Histories* which necessarily followed thereupon; but also the indecorousness of their *Allegories* to their *Deities*, which the *Epicureans* and *Jews* before, but now in *Philo's* time, the *Christians* had lately made great advantage of, for exposing the

the received *Religions*. When he makes *Anobret* (designed the same with *Sarah*) an ἐπιχόρευσις νύμφη. The very name of *Nymph* is *Allegorical*, and in the *Philosophical Allegories*, of a peculiar signification. This therefore *Philo* takes particular notice of, that from these *Allegories* of the *Phœnician Priests*, the *Greeks* had taken occasion to set up those which were so very offensive, and gave so great advantage to their common *Adversaries*.

Ἐνθεν Ἡσίοδος, ὅτι κυκλικοὶ πεποιημένοι θεογονίας, καὶ ἡγαντομαχίας, καὶ Τιτανομαχίας ἐπλασαν ἰδίας καὶ ἐκτομὰς οἷς συμπειφερόμενοι, ἐξενίκησαν τ' ἀλήθειαν. Philo ap. Euseb. Pr. Ev. l. 9.

These were the *Allegories* so much decry'd, not only by *Adversaries*, but disown'd by the *Philosophers* generally, and such generally as, with any judgment, undertook the defence of the received *Religions*: That the *Gods* should have a beginning, and be *Born* by the *Conjunction* of *Males* and *Females* like other *Mortals*, (this he means by their *θεογονίας*) That they should be molested by *Wars*, and reduced to so great *extremities*, as the *Fablers* pretended, in the *Wars* with the *Giants*, and *Typhon* and *Enceladus* and the *Titans*, (those were the *ἡγαντομαχίας* and *Τιτανομαχίας*) That they should *Emasculate* one another as *Saturn* is pretended to have

have served *Ouranus*, and *Jupiter* his Father *Saturn*, (those are the *Ἐτροπαῖ* here meant.) These the wisest Men looked on, not only as corruptions of their Histories, but as reproaches to their Gods, and Religions. *Plato* disowned them, and therefore sends *Homer* Crowned out of his Common-wealth. So did *Heraclides*, and generally the *Stoicks*, who for this very reason turned them into *Allegory*. So *Plutarch*, *Proclus* and *Macrobius*. And therefore here *Philo* thought he might do an acceptable piece of service to the common cause of *Philosophy* and *Paganism* in general, if he could from the *Originals* of these Fictions, shew that they were intended for no other but *Fictions*, by those who first invented them; and that they had no grounds in their First and most simple, and most creditable *Traditions* and *Histories*, but were superadded by those who neither did, nor could pretend to any new means of *Information*, and by this means disoblige their common cause, from the defence of what the common consent of their Wise men had granted, to be indeed so very indefensible.

§. XLV. HE pretends therefore, in his own *History*, to give us, from the fore-mentioned

mentioned Records, the Historical Truth concerning those Antient Persons and Actions of the *Phœnicians*, free from those Additional passages concerning them, which were only invented for designs of *Allegory*, whether by the *Greeks*, or the *Phœnician* Priests themselves. Yet neither so does his performance agree with his undertaking. However it comes to pass (whether through the heedlessness of *Philo*, or his *Injudiciousness* in his choice out of extant Histories, what he was to Father on his *Sanchoniathon*,) we have some things intermixed, which neither are likely to have been true, nor to have been designed for such by the Authors; may seem to have been designed for no other than *Allegorical* senses, and that in the worst most indefensible way of *Allegorizing*, from which he had pretended to vindicate their received Religion. He makes his *Saturn* *Emasculate* his Father *Ouranus*. Here is one of the *Ἐτροπαῖ* which he had before reckoned among the most *Scandalous* sort of *Allegories*. But this he may possibly pretend to have been done by his *Man Saturn*, who was afterwards by mistake made a *God*, especially as the name *God* implied not a *Divine Honour* only, but also a *Divine Nature*. And concerning

cerning the *Man* it might have been Historically true, and designed for no more by his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. But what shall we say to that which follows, where he makes the Blood that flowed from the wound of *Ouranus* to have passed into the Springs and Rivers? What? one Mans Blood, and from such a wound as that was, to have flowed into the Fountains and Rivers? Certainly this could have been meant for no other but an *Allegory*.

It is like what is told concerning *Osiris* among the *Ægyptians*, and the tears of *Sophia* among the *Valentinians*, who seem to have borrowed much of their *Heresie* from the *Ægyptians*, where it first appeared. And I can hardly doubt, but that this was intended by the *Authors* from whom he took it, to shew the true *Original* of *Fountains* and *Rivers*, that the *Waters* beneath the *Firmament*, as the Scripture distinguishes them, were derived from those above the *Firmament*; the *Fountains* of the *Deep* supplied from the *Windows* of *Heaven*; the *Fountains* and the *Rivers* nourished by the *Rain* which came from *Oueanòs*, in the larger Notion of it, as it includes the *Air* also. And possibly considering this as taken from *Taautus* an *Ægyptian*, by the *Rivers* might be meant the

the several *Ostia* and *Cuts* of *Nilus*, from which no doubt all the *Fountains* of *Ægypt* proceeded, which were accordingly turned also into *Blood*, when *Nilus* was so; and then he might allude to the Tradition of the *Ægyptians*, that *Nilus* was derived from *Heaven*, as *Diodorus* tells us.

So *Homer* calls it Διίπετῇ.

Πεῖν γ' ὅτ' αὖν Αἰγυπτίῳ Διίπετῇ ποταμοῖο
 ἄ τις ὕδωρ ἔλθῃς. —

And again,

Ἄλ' εἰς Αἰγυπτίῳ Διίπετῇ ποταμοῖο
 Στῆσαι νέας.

Αἰγυπτῇ with him is *Nilus*. And I am apt to think that the reason why he called it Διίπετῇ, was because, of all those many Opinions which were afterwards raised concerning the Rise of *Nilus*, he rather inclined to that which derived it from the *Air* which is called *Jupiter* and *Oueanòs*, as I said in the larger Sense, whether from the *Rain* or the melted *Snow*, both of which belong to *Jupiter* in the sense now mentioned. The most *Antient* and most *Popular* Opinions are most likely to have been intended by the *Mythologers*. And to prove that this was so, we cannot have a fitter Testimony than this of *Homer*. He is one of the most *Antient* of the *Pagan Writers*. As a *Poet*, he is most suited to *Vulgar* capacity, and of nearest affinity to the *Mythologists*. He was an *Ægyptian* Born, of the

the *Ægyptian Thebes*, if we may believe *Heliodorus*. But whether we believe him or not, yet it is more unanimously agreed, that he learned most of his Philosophical Notions from the *Ægyptians*. Whence it will follow, that this was most probably the Popular received opinion among the *Ægyptians* in the time of *Homer*. And of the Two Opinions (which as I said, do make for this purpose) one of them was received by most of the *Greatest* and most *Antient* even among the *Ægyptians* themselves. That the *Nilus* had its Original from *Rain*, was the

Opinion of (1) *Aristotle*, (2) *Agatharchides*, and of the *Ægyptian Priests*, as (3) *Endoxus* assures us. That it was from *Snow* was the sense of (4) *Democritus*, (5) *Anaxagoras*, (6) *Æschylus*, (7) *Sophocles*, (8) *Euripides*, and all (9) *Antiquity*, mentioned also by (10) *Lucretius* and (11) *Mela*, whether soever of the two be true, or was thought so by the

Antient Ægyptians, or by the most *Antient Philosophers*, (who in all likelyhood borrowed what they said concerning it from the *Ægyptians*) is equally subservient, to shew what might have been the actual sense of the pretended *Hermes* in this *Allegory*.

legory. And that *Nilus* is derived from the blood of the *Genitals* of *Ouranus*, rather than any other part, might have been to express the *Fruitfulness* of this *River* above all others. The *Slime* it brought along with it, manured the Land for *Corn*, and was withall so very *Prolifick*, as that it engendered several *Animals*, and made *Women* Fruitful that used the Water, and gave occasion to the Fancy of those *Antient Atheists*, who thought the first men produced out of the *Slime* of *Nilus*. Now if I have hit the meaning right in this instance, this will also afford a new Argument against our pretended *Sanchoniathon*. Either he pretended falsely that *Taautus* was free from these *Physiological Allegories*, especially from the *Scandalous* sort of them, and this was a mistake that must needs have been *willful*, and with ill *design*. He must needs have known from the Books themselves, if he had indeed any such Books, whether any such matter was so much as pretended by him. If it was *pretended*, but *falsely*; that will ruine the Credit of *Taautus* himself, and make him suspicious of being forged by some Modern concerned Author, which will consequently ruine the credit of *Sanchoniathon* also, if he pretend to know Fictions invented so long after

- (1) *Aristotle*. Anonym. ap. Phot. Cod. ccxlix.
 (2) *Agatharchides*. Diodor. Sicul. Bibl. L. i. Theoph. Simocatta ap. Phot. Cod. LXV.
 (3) Ap. Plutarch. de Plac. Philos. L. iv. c. i.
 (4) *Diodor. Sic. Bibl. L. i*
 (5) *Senec. Nat. Quæst. iv. 2.*
 (6) *Lucret. L. vi.*
 (7) *Mela. l. 9.*
 (8) *Diodor. Sic. Bibl. L. i.*

his own time. Or else he did not *confine* himself to those Informations of *Taautus*, which were indeed free from such *Allegories*. And this will also be another conviction of his *Unfincerity* in pretending what he did not intend to perform. In all likelihood it was *Philo* who here betrayed himself, and forgot the Person he was to Act under the name of *Sanchoniathon*. Which will be a conviction of his disingenuous dealing in this, as well as his other pretended means of *Information*.

§. XLVI. THIS seems to have been this Authors design in pretending to the now mentioned means of *Information*. If I might presume yet farther, to guess why he pitched on the very name of *Sanchoniathon*, on whom he was desirous to Father his Forgeries; I do not know whether it might not have been in imitation of the *Ægyptian Sonchis*, to whom *Solon* and *Pythagoras* are said to have been beholden for what discoveries were made to them of the *Ægyptian Philosophy*. He is stiled an Ἀρχαῖος φήτης, and Λογώτατος ἡ ἐξέων, one of the most Learned of their Priests of *Sais*, Characters excellently qualifying him for understanding their *Sacred Records*, those especially of his *Country-man* the *Ægyptian Mercury*. But yet because he was to make him as well

Solon, Plutarch in Solon. & de I. fid. & Ovid. Pythagoras Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.

well as *Mercury*, pass for *Phœnicians*; therefore he might think it fit a little to disguise his name with a termination different from that whereby he was known to the *Alexandrians*, as he had done in the name of *Mercury*. He calls him designedly *Taautus*, whom he confesses that the *Ægyptians* called Θωὺς, the *Alexandrians* Θωὺς. Why might he not accordingly call him *Sanchoniathon*, whom the *Ægyptians* called *Sonchis*, especially if by such a change he could draw such an Argument for his credit from his very name, as *Bochart* conceives? This *Sonchis* had taught *Solon* the Ἀτλαντικὸς λόγος. This seems to have been no other than the Ἀτλαντίων Θεολογία in *Diodorus Siculus*, and in all likelihood was the same with that of *Mercury*, as this of *Sanchoniathon* was professedly. For those *Atlantii* challenged *Mercury* for theirs, and made him the Son of *Maja* the Daughter of their famous *Astrological Atlas*, and it may be this was the reason why our pretended *Sanchoniathon* also thought fit to challenge *Atlas* as a *Phœnician*, that they might also have the double Title to that same *Philosophy*, on account of *Atlas* as well as of *Mercury*. I am apt to suspect that the occasion of this *Philosophy* of the *Atlantii* might have been taken from the men-

Diodor. Sic. Bibl. L. iii. ap. Euseb. Pr. Ev. L. ii.

tion of the *Atlantick Island* in *Plato's Timæus*. This, some Author well known to *Diodorus*, might (in imitation of the *Philosophical Mythologies*, then so much in fashion, and particularly of *Euemerus* who wrote his *Sacred History* from a like pretended Πεινήνοια of a fictitious *Island* called *Panchaia*) have made the Subject of new Discoveries. He might have Personated some who had found it, and in describing the place and the People, it very well became the *Poem*, to have given an account of their Sentiments, on those Subjects concerning which that Age was so very inquisitive and curious. Yet it also became it to derive them from *Atlas*, and so to fit their Opinions to his Person. Or perhaps it might rather have been that yet more antient account of *Solon*, concerning the *Atlantes* in Verse, from whom *Plato* took his first occasion, but (as *Plutarch* tells us) never lived to finish it. It should seem the design of these *Atlantick Discourses* both of *Solon* and *Plato* was much larger than that small account given in *Plato's Timæus*. From some of these, rather than *Timæus*, it is probable that *Ælian* had his Tradition that the *Kings of Atlantis* that were of *Neptunes* race, wore their *Diadems* of *Hee-goats* as their *Queens* did of *Shee-goats* hairs. The Nation

Plutarch.
Solon. p. 92.
96.

Ælian. de
Animal.
xv. 2.

Nation of the *Atlantes* are mentioned by the Antients as inhabiting at the foot of the Mount *Atlas*, the Ὠκεανὸν διέκρυτες in *Ælian*, upon whom these Traditions were immediately Fathered. And the Country thereabouts, as it is described by the same *Ælian* probably from the same Traditions, was very pleasant and *Sacred*, and upon both accounts, very fit for the Scene of such a *Poetick Philosophy*. But though that might have been the *Poetick Scene*, yet the *Ægyptians* seem to have been the *Poets* that contrived these Stories, that we may not admire how it should agree with the Doctrine of *Mercury*. For as *Plato* had it from *Solon*, so *Solon* seems to have pretended it no higher than *Sonchis* the *Ægyptian*. And considering the *Antiquity* pretended of these *Atlantians*, no Nation could or did pretend to such *Information* concerning a Nation situate in the *West* of *Africa* as the *Ægyptians*. Besides *Enoch* was taken for the same with this famous *Astrological Atlas*, as *Eupolemus* tells us. How could they have taken up this conjecture, but from the agreement they had observed between the Doctrines of *Atlas*, and those of *Enoch*? How could they guess at the Doctrine of *Enoch*, but by the *Apocryphal Writings* then extant under his name? The *Atlantick Doctrines*

Herodot.
Melpom.
Mela. 14.
8. *Plin.* N.
Hist. v. 18.

Ælian. A-
nim. vii. 2.

Eupolemus
ap. *Eus.* Pr.
Ev. L. ix.

Erines therefore agreed with those of the *Book of Enoch*, and that those agreed also with the Forgeries then extant under the name of *Mercury*, has already been observed. So that *Sonchis* taught *Solon* nothing but what had very well become the Person of *Sanchoniathon*.

§. XLVII. THUS I have endeavoured to give an account of the design of this whole *Fiction*, and that such a one as might agree both with the *Time* and *Person* of *Philo Byblius*. I have shewn what liberty the *Principles* of those *Philosophers* allowed them for the Practice of such *disingenuities*. I have shewn how little such an Author as *Sanchoniathon* was known before the time of *Philo Byblius*, notwithstanding all the search that had been made into the *Phœnician Records*, and how little regarded after. I have shewn how little he favoured of the Antient *simplicity*, and how much of the *Modern Emulations*. I have shewn how little creditable he is in his pretended means of *Information*, and how far from that singular *Love of Truth*, for which he would have it believed, that his *Sanchoniathon* was so particularly remarkable. I have shewn that those means themselves are also suspicious, either that they never were extant, as the *Memoires of Gideon*; or that they were Coun-

Counterfeited themselves, as the *Writings* of *Taautus* and the *Ammonians*, and that long after the time that *Sanchoniathon* is pretended to have lived in; that he could have followed no *Jewish Records* in his accounts of *Jewish* matters; and that his following the *Writings* of *Mercury* and the *Ammonians*, divulged so long after his pretended Age, are rather *Convictions* of his *False-hood*, than a *Recommendation* of his *Credit*. I have endeavoured also, as far as I could guess from the *Circumstances* he lived in, to give a particular account of the *occasion* and *design* of each particular observed in the management of this whole *Fraud*. And I know not what can be desired more for the *Conviction* of it at this distance of time, and loss of *Original Monuments*.

§. XLVIII. NOR can I see that this discovery will in the least injure the Cause for which those *Pious* as well as *Learned Persons* have been concerned, who have hitherto made use of this Author for *expounding* or *confirming* some *Historical* or *Philosophical* passages of *Scripture*. If there were any of these *Heathen Antiquities*, that could either pretend to the *Age* of the *Scriptures*, or to that even *Domestick Evidence* of being *genuine*, there might then be some pretence

pretence for reconciling or confirming some passages of the Scriptures by them for their use who did not grant the advantage of the *Sacred Writers* above their own in regard of their *Divine Inspiration*. But we never hear of any of those *Heathen* accounts of things mentioned in the Scriptures, before the Translation of the LXXII put them into an *Emulation*. Then it was that *Berosus*, and *Manetho*, and *Menander*, and *Letus* first made and published their Enquiries. No mention of the *Chaldean Xisuthrus*, nor of the *Ægyptian Hysis*, nor of *Abraham* nor *Moses*, nor the general *Diluge* in *Ctesias* or *Xenophon*, or *Herodotus*, or any of those more Antient certainly-genuine Writers. When they did publish them, the very *Records* pretended for them make them suspicious of Forgery. They were pretended only from *Sacred Pillars* extant in *Adyta*, and these very *Pillars* challenged in several places, yet not accessible by any who had been desirous to convict them. But the Scriptures were only then *Translated*. The *Originals* were extant long before in *Books accessible* and intelligible by any who had the curiosity to learn their *Tongue*. I do not insist on the *Translation* pretended to have been in *Plato's* time, because I find no better Arguments for it than

than guesses that *Plato* had some things from the *Sacred Writings*, which I believe he had not, besides that such a *Supposition* is directly contrary to the much better attested Story of *Aristæus* concerning the Translation performed by the command of *Ptolomy Philadelphus*. I rather choose those more Antient instances of *Theopompus* the Historian, and *Theodectes* the Poet, who had seen and understood these Books of the *Jews*, before the Translation of *Philadelphus*, as we are assured by *Demetrius Phalereus* in *Aristæus*, besides that even the Book of *Daniel*, one of the latest of them, was yet shewn to *Alexander the Great*, if we may believe *Josephus*. So that even from the *Greeks* we have as early Evidence of their being known, as we have of their being enquired after, or of their being in a capacity to understand them; and there can be no reason to expect earlier. Besides the repugnancy of those other Nations to each other, and of the different Authors even of the same Nation, were certain Arguments that they did not write from the same uniform and true *Records*, as the *Jews* who all agreed in the same Books, as *Josephus* observes. And for the *Pentateuch*, that of the *Samaritanes* must in all likelihood have been received from them before the time of the LXXII. both because the *Samaritanes* were before that so exasperated by the *Jews*, as that it is not likely they would receive any such thing from them, and because it should seem the *Prophets* were not then collected by the *Jews* that they might have been delivered to them, and because they still preserve it in the *Old Hebrew Character*, not in that which was afterwards introduced by *Esdra's*. Upon all these accounts it cannot

Ap. Joseph.
Ant. xii. 2.

Ant. xi. 8.

Cont. Ap.
pion. L. i. p.
1036. F.

cannot be thought reasonable either to oppose these *Heathen* accounts to the Scriptures, or to think that any thing can be made more creditable in the Scriptures, because it is confirmed by the consent of so exceptionable Authorities. I have rather shewn that the occasion of their agreeing in *Philosophical* matters; was rather their imitating and allowing the Authority of *Moses*, and making him the Standard of their several *Koσμολογίας*. Which may indeed be of use for shewing Historically how that part of *Moses* was actually understood from those times wherein these *Heathen* accounts were first produced; but can be of no farther use for shewing either the sense of *Moses*, or how the antient first Deliverers of his Doctrine did actually understand him, than as these things may be inferred, or presumed, from the actual sense of those later times, wherein these *Heathen Antiquities* first appeared.

E R R A T A.

Pag. 4. Marg. l. 4. *init.* Marg. l. 17. *can.* P. 22. l. 20. *Suet.*
ad. P. 32. l. 15. *Asclepius.* P. 43. l. 19. *u* [not a u but a
 Greek *u* with the first ray cut off.] P. 47. l. 7. [77] P. 48.
 l. 27. *Jasher.* P. 57. Marg. l. 3. — *lon.* l. 12. P. 58. l. 27.
disposal? P. 59. l. 15. *Diphyes.* P. 60. Marg. l. 5. *Sozo.* P. 61.
 l. 5. *U. C.* P. 65. l. 25. *were.* P. 73. l. 16. *in Ptolomy.* P. 91.
 l. 6. [77] [*Daleth* for *Resh.*] P. 98. l. penult. *they.* P. 112
 l. 7. *fictitious.* P. 116. l. 13. *Hysf.*

F I N I S.